

# THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

---

## Notes of Recent Exposition.

At a time when we are ready to include the exposition of the Bible among the lost arts, there come two expositions of the first rank of excellence. To add to the surprise, both are expositions of the Epistles of St. John. To complete the coincidence, both refer to the literature of their subject in the preface, and both state that Rothe's exposition has never been translated into English, although a fine translation has been in existence for the last fifteen years.

---

That both volumes consist of lectures is no surprise. But it would be a surprise if the lectures had been delivered from the pulpit. For if the general art of exposition is nearly lost, the special art of expository preaching seems to be altogether a thing of the past. One of the volumes consists of lectures which were delivered to the students of Headingley College, Leeds. It is Professor Findlay's *Fellowship in the Life Eternal* (Hodder & Stoughton; 10s. 6d.). The other contains the Kerr Lectures, delivered to the students in the Glasgow College of the United Free Church of Scotland. Its title is *The Tests of Life* (T. & T. Clark; 7s. 6d. net). The author is the Rev. Robert Law, B.D., Minister of Lauriston Place Church, Edinburgh.

---

We are not about to compare the volumes. There is no comparison between them. The

one follows the good old method of verse by verse exposition. The other adopts the new method of grouping together the passages which bear upon a common theme. They supplement one another. Dr. Findlay is not superseded by Mr. Law; and Mr. Law is not made dispensable by Dr. Findlay. We propose to consider a difficult passage dealt with by both, and to see how they deal with it.

---

It is the great central declaration in 1 Jn 4<sup>2.3</sup>. In the familiar words of the Authorized Version it reads: 'Every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God: and every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God.'

---

This is the true 'Apostles' Creed.' And it is as exact in its terms as a creed must be, as exact as any creed that ever was drawn up. 'The statement,' says Mr. Law, 'simple as it is, is of exquisite precision.' He proceeds to show how exquisite. First, 'the verb that is used (ἐρχεσθαι) implies the pre-existence of Christ.' Next, 'the tense of that verb (ἐληλυθότα) points to His coming not only as a historical event but as an abiding fact. The Word has become flesh for ever.' Then, 'the noun (σάρξ) indicates the fulness of His participation in human nature, the *flesh* being that element which is in most obvious contrast with His former state of being.

Even the preposition (*ἐν*) is of pregnant significance. It is not altogether equivalent to *into* (*εἰς*). The gnostics also believed that Christ came into the flesh. But the assertion is that He has so come into the flesh as to abide therein; the Incarnation is a permanent union of the Divine with human nature. Finally, this union is realized in the self-identity of a Person, Jesus Christ, who is at once Divine and human.'

Professor Findlay sees the precision of St. John's words also, though he does not lay it out so elaborately. He is more occupied with the confession itself, its contents, and the progress that it records from St. Paul's primitive 'Jesus is Lord.' What *is* this Creed or Confession?

According to the Authorized Version it is: 'That Jesus Christ is come in the flesh.' But everybody could confess that, and in doing so confess nothing. If there is exquisite precision in the language of the creed, there must be no less exquisite precision in the creed itself. In order to make the meaning clear in English, Professor Findlay and Mr. Law both introduce the little word *as*, though there is nothing corresponding to it in the Greek. Professor Findlay introduces it after Christ: 'Every spirit which confesseth Jesus Christ as come in flesh.' And to bring out his interpretation he demands an emphasis upon each of the words: *Jésus Christ come in flesh*, as he prints them, 'so that the Divine origin and rights of Jesus and His advent in this capacity into human bodily life may be acknowledged.' Mr. Law places the *as* before Christ—'Every spirit that confesseth Jesus as Christ come in the flesh.'

The question, therefore, that is answered by this Apostles' Creed is the question, Who is Jesus? That has been the question always. It will be the question to the end. But the exact emphasis that is put upon it has not always been the same. And the answer must be according to the emphasis.

There was a difference, as Dr. Findlay points out, even by the time St. John wrote. In the earlier days when the question was put, 'Who is Jesus?' the answer made by the unbeliever was 'He is anathema.' For the unbeliever was a Jew, and his countrymen had crucified Jesus. He is anathema, he said. Has He not been crucified, and come under the curse of the law? 'Cursed,' says the Law, 'is every one that hangeth on a tree.' The answer of the believer, the answer of St. Paul, was 'Jesus is Lord.' In one telling phrase (*κύριος Ἰησοῦς*) he removed the anathema and reversed it.

But by St. John's day the emphasis has changed, and the answer must be different. Now the unbeliever is a philosopher, possibly a speculative theologian and born within the borders of the Church itself. He does not dispute the Messiahship of Jesus. What he disputes is His pre-existence, His godhead, His rank in the realm of spiritual beings. He separates Jesus from Christ, not by historical distinction (as in our day), but by metaphysical analysis. St. John's answer, therefore, is fuller than St. Paul's, and every word is chosen carefully. 'Every spirit that confesseth not Jesus as Christ come in the flesh is not of God.'

We have spoken of the expository lecture as now so rarely heard from the pulpits of our land. What has taken its place? It would be a gain if what is called 'the running commentary' should take its place. But where the expository lecture was easy (it was its easiness that brought about its end), the running commentary is difficult exceedingly, and very few are the preachers who have yet had the courage to attempt it.

It is not that there is no time for it. An occasional word, an occasional sentence, is all that it means. And the congregation as they follow the reading, book in hand, need not lift up their



eyes. The reading, let us say, is in the First Epistle of St. John, the fourth chapter. The preacher has reached the sixteenth verse. The words are, 'And we have known and believed the love that God hath to us.' He simply says, 'Not merely "We have known and believed," but "We have known, and we have believed."'

He says this because to the ordinary English reader 'we have known and believed' is only a single statement. It is either 'we have known,' or it is 'we have believed.' It even loses its force as a single statement by the use of the two verbs when one would be sufficient.

But the preacher knows that it is two distinct statements. He knows that the second verb is as emphatic as the first, and for that matter a bigger mouthful in the Greek (*ἐγνώκαμεν καὶ πιστεύκαμεν*). And by simply inserting 'we have' as he reads, he arrests the attention on the double statement, and makes the congregation ask silently what the two statements are.

What are the two statements? Westcott says that when St. John has stated that we know the love which God has to us, he suddenly recalls himself. He remembers that we do not know it perfectly. As God is greater than our heart, so the love of God is greater than the heart of man can embrace. He accordingly adds, 'but we believe that it is greater than we know.'

Professor Findlay assents. But Mr. Law will have none of it. 'I cannot agree with Westcott,' he says, 'that the addition of "we have believed" is due to the conscious imperfection attaching to the "we have known." For it cannot be too strongly insisted upon, that the verb to *know* (*γινώσκειν*) signifies spiritual perception; while the verb to *believe* (*πιστεύειν*) expresses, the resultant intellectual conviction.' He would therefore translate, or paraphrase, the passage: 'We have recognized (in the fact that Jesus is the Son of

God) the love which God hath toward us, and are firmly persuaded of its truth.'

Is the story of the Tower of Babel and the Confusion of Tongues historical?

The question is worth asking. It is a question even for the historian and the man of science. Because, if it is historical, it is central and controlling. Other ideas and theories of the origin of languages and of the peopling of the earth must fall into conformity with it. But the preacher must ask the question more imperatively. His whole attitude to the Old Testament depends upon its answer.

For if the story of the Tower of Babel is not historical, he cannot use it as history, and his first feeling is the pain of loss. If he is determined to deal honestly, he finds himself gradually retreating from great sections of the Bible. This incident never occurred; that patriarch never existed. His next feeling is anger against the critics of the Old Testament, and resentment of all their ways. 'Ye have taken away the materials of my sermons, and what have I more?'

Professor W. G. Jordan, in his new book on *Biblical Criticism and Modern Thought* (T. & T. Clark; 7s. 6d. net), answers the modern Levite. He does not say that the story of the Tower of Babel is historical. He does not deny that those preachers who have lived and worked during the last generation have had the painful experience of having to let go as strictly historical some of the narratives of the Old Testament. But he says that they need not feel resentment. They have lost them for a little, that they may find them again in a richer, more profitable form.

Certainly no preacher will give up any of the Old Testament stories lightly. And there are many incidents and experiences in the Old Testament which may still be taken, as they have



always been taken, literally, and used for immediate edification. Professor Jordan gives an instance. It is the 73rd Psalm.

The 73rd Psalm is not a Psalm of Asaph, as its title tells us. It is a late poem. The title must go. But the psalm is none the worse of that. It is even the better. For now we see more freely how close it comes to the Spirit of Christ. 'Simply to paraphrase the psalm, to tell in clear simple words how its author fought and conquered doubt, this in itself is helpful and inspiring. If we care to follow with close attention the story of this "Pilgrim's Progress through Doubt to a Higher Faith," we are face to face with a spiritual conflict which, both as to substance and as to form, is not unlike the battle which we ourselves sometimes have to meet.'

The difficulty, however, is not so much with the psalms or even with the incidents in the historical books. It is with the stories of world-wide significance contained in the early chapters of Genesis—the most picturesque and impressive of all that the Old Testament contains. Even then the preacher will not lightly surrender. He will not surrender them at any rate until he has consulted the monuments. Do the monuments of Babylon help him to retain the story of the Tower of Babel and to believe in the Confusion of Tongues?

Professor Jordan goes with the preacher to the monuments. First he looks into Professor Orr's *Problem of the Old Testament*. Professor Orr is very reluctant to surrender the historical character of the Tower of Babel. What does he say about it?

He says that 'there is a growing conviction that the plain of Shinar, or Southern Babylonia, was really the centre of distribution of the families of mankind.' The centre of distribution? It is a good phrase. Does it mean that all mankind were once gathered as one nation on the

plains of Babylon and were thence actually dispersed, as the narrative in Genesis seems to say they were? Read the next sentence. 'Babylonian civilization is carried back by the discoveries at Nippur to a period so much earlier than that of any other known civilization, that the inference seems irresistible that it is the source from which these other civilizations are derived.'

Now to say that all other known civilizations are likely to have come from the civilization of Babylonia, even if it is true—and Professor Flinders Petrie is dissipating the probability of it rapidly—is a very different thing from saying that all the languages of the earth have come from one language that once was spoken in the plain of Shinar. Professor Jordan turns to the archæologist Professor Hommel.

The ninth verse of the story, says Professor Hommel, the verse which gives the name of Babel to the city and the tower, is probably a later addition. For, he adds, Babel was certainly not among the *oldest* sanctuaries of the land of Shinar. And 'by this bit of minute criticism,' says Professor Jordan, 'the archæologist destroys the point of the story; but in so doing he shows that he realizes the immense age that lies behind the movements and migrations of humanity, and that we do not reach anything primitive when we arrive at Babel.'

But Professor Jordan does not even yet dismiss the story as unhistorical. He turns to Dr. Pinches. And Dr. Pinches is at first highly comforting. He admits that for the confusion of tongues 'there is, of course, no historical evidence,' and that 'the Babylonian inscriptions know nothing of it.' But he adds at once that there were many languages spoken at Babylon, and that a stranger visiting it could not help being struck by their number.

That is scarcely sufficient, however. The question is, Was the whole earth of one language, and was Babylon 'the centre of distribution'? 'There is



great improbability,' says Dr. Pinches, 'that the statement that the whole earth was of one language and of one speech was ever believed by thinking men at the time as an actual historical fact. A better translation would be "the whole land," that is, the whole tract of country from the Mountains of Elam to the Mediterranean Sea.'

This, at last, is clear enough, and it is creditable to the courage of the archæologist who has made it. For it must be remembered that the book in which it is made, *The Old Testament in the Light of the Historical Records of Assyria and Babylon*, was published by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. But it seems to destroy our last hope of being able to cling to the historical character of the Tower of Babel.

Suppose, then, that we have to come to the conclusion that the story of the Tower of Babel and the Confusion of Tongues is unhistorical. Is it lost to the preacher? Professor Jordan believes that it is not lost. He believes that there is a better and a richer use to be made of it now than when it was historical.

In the first place we can work a little critical analysis over it, and perhaps discover, as Gunkel has done, that there are two distinct stories in it, one relating to a city, the other to a tower. We may notice also in the course of our criticism that both stories belong to the Yahwist stratum, whence the gracious fact that Yahweh 'interferes' in the affairs of men, and always for their good. Always for their good, whether they see that at the time or not—a most fruitful consideration for the future history of Israel and of the world.

But there is more than that. From the structure of the story let us pass to its origin.

It originated in Babylonia. Of that there cannot be a doubt. Where else is the wide plain and the Temple Tower? But it was not written down by a Babylonian. That is just as unmistakable.

For the whole attitude is that of a foreigner. And the foreigner is a Hebrew. The supreme God is Yahweh. The name 'Babel' is a play upon a Hebrew verb. The surprise of the writer at the great brick buildings rising out of the plain is the surprise of a dweller in Palestine.

And yet this story is no Hebrew writer's invention. Behind the narrative may be detected the signs of an earlier and more heathen conception. It is, in short, a wide-circulating and probably, very ancient folk-narrative worked over in the interest of the supremacy of Yahweh, the God of Israel.

Is its interest entirely literary, then, and has it no historical value? Professor Jordan does not say so. He sees clearly that it belongs to a pre-scientific age. Yet he says that the questions which it handles are questions which science still has to occupy itself with. And if its handling of them is more poetical than scientific, it is not of less value (not of less value to science) on that account, but probably of more value. For the science of to-day will be superseded by the science of to-morrow. But poetry, out of which science came at first, will always endure, to furnish new stimulus to scientific investigation and to brace scientific minds to face the old problems over again, and at last, above all other discoveries, to find their solution in God.

Professor Jordan quotes from Loofs, and closes: 'What the author of our story, who was quite certainly a pious Israelite and no Babylonian, had heard concerning Babel's old history and its old buildings, that he uses for the purpose of exhibiting Yahweh's power in the history of the first beginnings of human culture. The history of our text teaches us how a pious Israelite of old Israel sets the oldest history of mankind in the light of his faith.'

Jesus 'marvelled' (Mt 8<sup>10</sup>).

And we marvel that He should ever have



marvelled. It is no surprise that others marvelled at Him.

---

The disciples marvelled. He said to the fig tree, 'Let there be no fruit from thee henceforward for ever. And immediately the fig tree withered away. And when the disciples saw it, they marvelled, saying, How did the fig tree immediately wither away' (Mt 21<sup>19, 20</sup>). Pilate marvelled. 'Pilate again asked him, saying, Answerest thou nothing? behold how many things they accuse thee of. But Jesus no more answered anything; insomuch that Pilate marvelled' (Mk 15<sup>4, 5</sup>). The whole multitude marvelled. He dispossessed a dumb man. 'And when the devil was cast out, the dumb man spake: and the multitudes marvelled, saying, It was never so seen in Israel' (Mt 9<sup>33</sup>). Even the Pharisees and Herodians marvelled. 'Is it lawful,' they asked, 'to give tribute unto Cæsar, or not?' For they would 'catch him in talk' if they could. 'Jesus said unto them, Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's. And they marvelled greatly at him' (Mk 12<sup>17</sup>). We do not wonder that men marvelled at Him, that they marvelled greatly. The wonder is that He ever found occasion to marvel at men. What did He marvel at?

---

There are just two things at which He ever marvelled. The one thing was the absence of faith, the other was its presence.

---

He came into His own country. He entered the synagogue and began to teach. When they heard Him they were astonished. They were astonished at the wisdom of the words which came from His mouth, and they were astonished at the mighty works which were wrought by His hands. But, then, He was one of themselves. They knew His family. They had seen Him at His trade. They did not say, Being so wise and so powerful, He must be the Son of God. They said, Being the son of Mary, how can he be so wise and so powerful? 'And he marvelled because of their unbelief' (Mk 6<sup>6</sup>). That was the one occasion.

The other occasion on which He marvelled was at the faith of a Roman centurion.

---

Now in the case of the Roman centurion it is not easy to see what He marvelled at. We are told that 'when He heard it' He marvelled, and said to them that followed, 'Verily I say unto you, I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel' (Mt 8<sup>10</sup>). What had He heard?

---

He had heard the centurion say, 'I am not worthy that thou shouldest come under my roof.' Was that what He marvelled at? It could not be that. For John the Baptist once said, 'The latchet of whose shoes I am not worthy to stoop down and unloose.' If the centurion's faith was shown in recognizing the distance between Jesus and himself, John's faith was as great as his. And John belonged to Israel.

---

But the centurion believed that Jesus could heal with a word. Jesus heard him say, 'Speak the word only, and my servant shall be healed.' That also showed great faith. Yet there was once a woman who believed that Jesus could heal without a word, without ever seeing or knowing anything about the patient. And she was healed. She came in the crowd behind, and touched His garment. For she said, 'If I touch but his garments, I shall be made whole.' And straightway the fountain of her blood was dried up; and she felt in her body that she was healed of her plague (Mk 5<sup>28, 29</sup>). And she also belonged to Israel.

---

But, again, the centurion recognized that Jesus had authority over the powers that heal. The commentators with one consent say that the greatness of his faith consisted in that. The centurion recognized that Jesus was like himself. He himself can say to one, Go, and he goeth; to another, Come, and he cometh. Jesus is able to order and to be obeyed. And they who obey Him are not soldiers or slaves. They are the unseen angels, principalities or powers, that have the health of the body in their keeping.



It was a very great act of faith. But had Jesus never met with such an act of faith in Israel? The very chapter of St. Matthew's Gospel in which the narrative occurs opens with a similar act of faith, although it is expressed more briefly. 'And when he was come down from the mountain, great multitudes followed him. And behold, there came to him a leper and worshipped him, saying, Lord, if thou wilt, thou canst make me clean' (Mt 8<sup>1</sup>). The leper may have doubted the will, and he may not; at any rate he recognized the power. And the leper was no doubt an Israelite. We have still to ask what the centurion said or did to call forth Christ's emphatic commendation.

Now, it is a curious circumstance that in all the interpretations of this passage which one can turn to, the emphasis is laid upon the fact that the centurion was a man with authority. The comparison is made between his ability to command his servants and Christ's ability to command the unseen powers that heal. But the centurion says, not that he is a man *with* authority, but that he is a man under authority. And what relation his being *under* authority to a superior bears to his having authority over inferiors, no one seems able to make out; except, of course, the general commonplace which all the commentaries repeat, that he only can command who has first learned to obey.

But the centurion says more than that he himself is under authority. He says that Jesus is under authority. There is a word in the Greek which the translators of the Authorized Version seem to have looked upon as superfluous. The Revisers fortunately counted no words superfluous; and whether they understood it or not they took this little word in. It is the word 'also'—'for I also (καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ) am a man under authority.' 'I also,' he says. Clearly he looked upon Jesus as a man under authority like himself. Was Jesus a man under authority?

The Rev. W. H. Carnegie, M.A., Canon of

Birmingham, has published a book on *Churchmanship and Character* (Murray; 3s. 6d. net). It must be a volume of sermons. For it is further described as 'Three Years' Teaching in Birmingham Cathedral.' But it is divided into chapters, not into sermons. And the teaching goes steadily forward until, 'in the fifth chapter,' it reaches the question, What was the secret of Jesus? What was the principle which will explain His personal power and 'impressiveness? Canon Carnegie's answer is, He was 'a man under authority.'

The centurion had said that he was not worthy that Jesus should come to him, or even that he himself should stand in Jesus' presence. He had said that Jesus did not need to come, He could heal with a word and at a distance. He had said that Jesus could control the powers that heal, as he himself can say to his servant or slave, Do this, and he doeth it. All this was the evidence of faith, the evidence of great faith, though we may doubt that it surpassed anything that Jesus had seen in Israel. But when the centurion recognized that Jesus, like himself, was a man under authority, Jesus saw that he had penetrated to the secret of His life, and turning to them that followed Him said, 'I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel.'

For this *was* the secret of Jesus' life. He expressed it so, says Canon Carnegie, at the beginning: 'Wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business?' He expressed it so in the middle: 'For I came down from heaven not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me.' He expressed it so at the end: 'Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass away from me; nevertheless, not as I will, but as thou wilt.'

This, says Canon Carnegie, is the meaning of His presence here upon earth. He came to do the Father's will. He is under authority as a soldier. You may find the soldier enjoying the company of his messmates at table; you may find him following the funeral of a comrade to the grave. But



his business is not to provide mirth for his fellows, or mingle his tears with those of the bereaved. These things come in the course of the campaign, but his business is to obey his commanding officer. And in his obedience he accepts pain and privation as they come; even death itself; not welcoming them, but not overwhelmed by them. The one impression that is present with him throughout is that he is a man under authority.

Jesus was such a soldier. He had piped, and some of them had danced. He had mourned, and some of them had lamented with Him. But only one of them had penetrated to the secret of His life, and had recognized that whatever He did, He did it not by His own will but at the will of His commanding officer. And that man was a Gentile.

'I also,' he said, 'am a man under authority.' Therefore—not because he is a man *in* authority, but because he is a man *under* authority—he can say to one, Go, and he goeth; to another, Come, and he cometh. For the soldier to whom the command is issued knows that it is not the

command of this centurion merely; it is the command of the Roman Emperor. If the centurion were at the moment in rebellion against the Emperor, his command would not have the force of an Imperial command. He is not in rebellion. In every order he gives he seeks loyally to carry out the Emperor's will. Therefore—because he is a man under authority, he says to his servant, Do this, and he doeth it.

Did the centurion recognize that Jesus Himself was Emperor? He could scarcely do that. We are told that at the cross another centurion said, 'Truly this was the Son of God.' Did *he* mean that Jesus was Emperor, the highest authority in the spiritual realm? Perhaps scarcely even he. Certainly this centurion did not. But he recognized that Jesus was in entire sympathy with that supreme Spiritual Authority who at a word will send more than twelve legions of angels to execute His desires. Thou also, he said, art a man under authority. Thy word is the word of the Highest. Speak the word only and my servant shall be healed.

## The New Philosophy.

BY THE REV. J. G. JAMES, D.LIT., M.A., CHRIST CHURCH, ENFIELD.

At the present day we have in our midst a new gospel in philosophy, which is designated a philosophical method, if it cannot yet be called a system.<sup>1</sup> It is a reactionary movement from the long-prevailing and dominant Idealism or Absolutism. Like all movements of thought it effects the completion of the cycle; or it may be, the spiral line of progress, as future judgment may determine. In most respects it has an interesting parallel in the movement from Plato to Aristotle; the Idealism and the abstractions of the one giving place to the Realism and the concreteness of the other.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Vide W. James, *The Will to Believe* and *Pragmatism*; and Schiller, *Humanism*, etc.

<sup>2</sup> The parallel is still more complete by the *New Realism* which is coming into prominence.

The emergence of this new method or system claims to be akin to the advance of thought in these masters of ancient philosophy.

No very high degree of prophetic insight is required to detect signs of considerable popularity that may attach to this new philosophic creed. For one thing, it is intensely interesting for its own sake, in that a man should be supposed to have the power to create or affect in any sense the truth that he desires or wishes to believe; or, at least, that he should have his share in determining that truth,—such a doctrine cannot fail to have its attractions. Further, it promises to provide a bridge to which men of science would not hesitate to commit their footsteps, in order to reach the realm of truth hitherto regarded as



transcendental, rather than take the long stride which the Idealistic philosophy demands of them. Already Mr. H. G. Wells, in his paper before the Oxford Philosophical Society, has professed his admiration of the new creed, and his would be the attitude of many persons of the same order of mind. Then, too, what cannot be entirely disregarded, the style in which the epoch-making papers are written is so luminous, that the ordinary reader would find much to charm in these disquisitions. Of their appeal to 'the young and virile,' and the claim in this gospel to be a refuge from fatalism and despair, we would say nothing at present, but leave the readers of the various works to pronounce upon their value.

The name originally given to the new philosophy is to be discarded in favour of that of 'Humanism.' 'Pragmatism' was a term awkward enough to prejudice a system at its birth.<sup>1</sup> Humanism, whether truly descriptive of the philosophy to which it is attached, has a sufficiently comforting and safe ring about it to secure its popularity. Dr. F. C. S. Schiller claims kinship with Protagoras, as expressed in his saying, 'Man is the measure of all things,' and applies his term 'Humanism' to the whole man, to arrive at truth, in his threefold nature, intellect, emotion, and will; the mental function most prominently active being apparently will, and the least, intellect. Humanism is a wider and more far-reaching principle than Pragmatism, and is certainly a happier term. It is a 'declaration of the independence of the concrete whole of man with all his passions expurgated.' Thus it signalizes a revolt against Intellectualism and all abstractions as such. Professor W. James lays great stress upon the living character of our hypotheses in the exercise of choice, and shows that belief is determined by those propositions which for us possess life and engage our active interests. This teaching lays claim also to being essentially *practical*. No barren abstractions are made, but the whole man is engaged in the quest of truth, and the truth as it is attained is tested by means of its efficacy to promote and realize the practical ends and uses of life. This is the reason for Professor James' choice of the term 'Pragmatism.' Pragmatism is the method that is chiefly employed

in the theory of knowledge, whilst Humanism embraces this and extends the method to all problems of philosophy.

It is easy to misunderstand and misrepresent these writers, and there has been a complaint that their doctrines have been misapplied. Even so eminent a thinker as Dr. F. H. Bradley has confessed that he has failed to understand their exact meaning. So far as we are able to understand the creed, we shall attempt, as briefly as possible, to set it forth, with the reservation that it may yet be stated so much more fully and adequately to meet and fulfil all that an explanation of experience may demand. In our search for truth, the desire, purpose, or end must always be taken into account, and truth is gained, to the extent that it has called into operation these powers, emotional and otherwise, which tend to the realization of life, and may be used in the interests of life. Truth consists largely in the right attitude of mind, and, indeed, of the whole man. Our conviction of reality is based upon our rightly directed efforts. We believe and accept as truth, that which we ourselves discover, and which is calculated to contribute to the enrichment of our lives. In this sense, by the exercise of will, and the direction of purpose, we *make* truth: not that we alter objective fact, or create objective reality as such; but it is directly as the result of our own efforts that truth becomes truth for us. Even then it is not that we reflect it in our own perceptive consciousness, but the effort of the will is involved in determining what truth is. The test of truth is not that our conceptions are found to correspond with reality as a copy; nor that a clear presentment of truth is made to the intelligence. That is truth which in ourselves makes for action, and for the practical utilities of life, apart from any so-called objective counterpart. Truth, then, consists then of postulates that are necessary for the development of life. 'For whatever forms of the latter (the Real) we may have discovered, some purposive activity, some conception of a good to be obtained, was involved as a condition of the discovery. If these had been directed to ends other than it was, there could not have been discovery, or that discovery.'<sup>2</sup>

Now all this is clearly directed against the doctrines of the Absolute which make Thought to be the supreme Reality, and in relation to which

<sup>2</sup> *Humanism*, etc., p. 12.

<sup>1</sup> Pragmatism is not to be confounded with the *Pragmatism* of C. S. Peirce, nor the *Humanism* of Schiller with that of Mackenzie.



all that is reasonable is to be established. The teleological element is exalted to the place of honour, but it is the end of the human being for himself that is to be sought. The ontological arguments become entirely subordinate, if indeed they are not ruled out of court, for the reason that logical and metaphysical abstractions can never exist apart from the operation of the person as a complete whole, making for his own realization. It is perhaps hardly necessary to examine the criticism that the Humanists have directed against Absolutism, for there will be many who object to the abstract character of certain transcendental theories, who would not be prepared to pin their faith to Humanism nor to accept it as a substitute for Absolutism. We may, however, point out some of the elements of value in the new system, and indicate in what respects we consider it to be imperfect or inadequate.

We can trace most important bearings in the insistence upon the right attitude of mind towards truth. It surely cannot be considered satisfactory, even on psychological grounds, that truth should be simply presented, or, as it were, reflected upon the mind, without any effort on its part. Every man must surely receive the truth, 'in the love of it'; and be prepared to assimilate to what there is of truth within, of the truth that he would receive from without. Truth as regarded as objective can of course receive no addition from the percipient. A thing is not true because we wish or will it to be. But, on the other hand, a person may become constitutionally unfit to receive truth, on account of the 'lie in the soul,' and every mind must contribute its own share to the perception of truth. Now this involves active attention, selective interest, desire, purpose, and will; and thus ethical considerations immediately emerge. The quest of truth is never a cold, academic, and profitless intellectual pursuit; it involves the bent and direction of the whole nature of the seeker. In this sense, what is imperatively required to know the truth, is the possession of truth 'in the inward parts.' Dr. Schiller, like another memorable personage, has discovered that he has been using an instrument of thought all his (philosophical) life, and never knew it! Many others also have used it, and a valuable instrument it is. The pursuit of knowledge is invested with life and power, as the seeker throws all the varied activities of his nature, passion, interest, and desire into the

quest, which he follows with a deliberate purpose directed towards the realization of his whole nature. It is, moreover, a solace to those who are in religious doubt to find that truth is gained by living, and that faith finds its solution in the actualities of earnest work. 'If any man willet to do . . . he shall know of the teaching.' Indeed, we may find hints of this method in so unlikely a source as Tyndall, who in his Belfast address says: 'Man never has been, and he never will be, satisfied with the operations and products of the Understanding alone.'

Such a practical system is doubtless a welcome reaction from the tendency amongst some of the Romantic Schools to endow the qualities, attributes and abstractions, of personality with a higher degree of reality than, and a superiority to, the concrete. Moral laws have often been deified and worshipped, and it is high time that *mere* concepts should be dethroned from the exalted position in which they have been placed, by reason of their very abstractness, as distinguished from concrete forms of existence.

Nevertheless, we are bound to offer the criticism that the value of Humanism as a philosophical method is entirely that in which it is consistent with the use of other systems, and that the moment it repudiates other forms and claims to be a new and distinctive method of itself, it appears to be inadequate for the purpose. If we understand it aright, there is no explanation of the origin of the purpose that has duly emerged in consciousness. If in the course of Evolution there has come to be an instinctive impulse towards the realization of life, if throughout the whole course of natural processes, there has been a teleological element which has come to be a deliberate purpose in human consciousness, where was the intelligence that held the end in view, and has been working towards it unceasingly? The reply would be, we know nothing about it, nor even whether it exists, until we apply the method to this as well as to other problems. Still the mind will seek to know the origin of that very purpose, which it is called upon to employ, and will go behind and below its own purpose, and will want to know the reason for its own interest, and why the interest should minister to life and not the reverse. We may make this clearer, perhaps, by reference to the end itself. The end is to be useful, and useful means to conserve the purpose of life. If this is the



correct reading of the principle, then we shall require to know what are the constituents of life at its best, whether, for instance, they consist in its quality, quantity, or duration, and what is the nature of its enrichment. It is hard to see how the purpose is to be conceived without reference to ideals, or how the purpose can at all be shaped without going in advance of conduct, at least, in the order of thought. Do not our aspirations reach towards that which is really higher than actual experience? It seems impossible to frame a purpose without certain presentational elements, which must possess logical consistency, or some reference to the system of things, or be subject to certain regulative ideas. It may be conceded that all thought is purposive, and yet there lies beyond a region that is immediate to consciousness, that gives the purpose its significance and its whole meaning, and of which the mind is conscious as not yet having realized. This sphere of the transcendental, with its concepts and ideals and its regulative principles, must be postulated ere the method can be brought into operation, and this is the field for the scope of pure reasoning. Possibly Dr. Schiller would include all this as part of his method, inasmuch as you have the selective interest, and the bearing of all upon the development of life. It is part and parcel of that usefulness which determines its peculiar value. But even if we allow this, the question will arise, Why should such speculations and ideals, when rightly pursued, contribute to the richness of life and the fulness of being? If we reply that we make them do so, the idea still floats before our vision, and the intellect is never satisfied unless it runs ahead of practice. It seems to us that idealistic implications are introduced at every turn, and that it becomes a valid method only so far as these are not ignored. Otherwise, if these are barred, and nothing but truth as a postulate is admissible, then we get back to the circle, and no explanation is possible at all. Sooner or later we return to ultimate questions, and the mind will ask what gives cogency to reasoning, consistency to thought, moral value to conduct, and meaning to life. These will not be shelved by the introduction of merely practical questions, for we shall come to find that these are ultimately the most practical, and it is impossible to conceive of anything that contributes to such ends as not being practical, or indeed to say where

the line is drawn between the practical and the unpractical.

We grant that man is never a mere thinker, nor should he be, if he could, but it is difficult to conceive how any sublime purpose can be formed without the presence of an ideal, which has not yet entered into actual experience. We may argue that the man himself has something of the sublime within him, as determined by his selective interest. This we do not attempt to deny, and yet we must conceive that ideal as being in advance of what he actually is, else no subjective excellence will be of the slightest use. It may be objected that we too often conceive an Absolute as infinite in such a way as to exclude all content, a barren negative idea, such as an unlimited and undetermined deity. This is of course open to objection, but a man really does need a deity of some sort, that is not altogether determined by the worshipper's own attitude, and he feels that that deity must be an expression of his own highest conception of truth, beauty, and goodness, and yet be superior to what the man has it in his own power to conceive or attain. All that a man aims at, he feels to be existent in the ideal, and for him, only as it is his ideal; but it would destroy its whole value to say that the ideal is entirely within his own power to create.

The use of the term 'postulate' may connote a great deal, and if it is made to cover the most important idealistic implications, it is difficult to understand in what sense Humanism has superseded 'the old and effete' Absolutism. If it does not, it leaves something to be desired to deliver the thinker from a subjectivity which is itself overwhelming and paralyzing by reason of the tremendous issues that devolve upon the individual, who has to live his own life, and work out his own destiny, unaided by that power, not himself, that makes for righteousness.

In the somewhat fluid state of the controversy, Dr. Schiller might even be prepared to grant all that we ask with respect to the immediate apprehension of the ideal. In that case, the truth and reality of the ideal would have to be established for the experient by the criterion of usefulness. It seems to us, however, that if the ideal had not its own inherent goodness, truth, and reality, prior to any experience of its value, it would have little power to influence character or affect action, as the man would then be following the creations of



his own mind, which become valid only as he wills them to be so. Human nature in its entirety seems to require for its uplifting what is superior to itself, and is not dependent, in the first instance, upon the man's conduct. The very purpose requires an ideal that is in advance of attainment, else it is not an ideal at all.

We may conclude this sketch by expressing appreciation of this method, which, so far as it goes, is a distinct contribution to the science of conduct and life, which is certain to evoke moral enthusiasm, even though we seem to require idealistic assumptions for its completion.

## The Great Text Commentary.

### THE GREAT TEXTS OF REVELATION.

#### REVELATION I. 5, 6.

'Unto him that loveth us, and loosed us from our sins by his blood; and he made us to be a kingdom, to be priests unto his God and Father; to him be the glory and the dominion for ever and ever. Amen.'

—R.V.

#### THE SITUATION.

St. John was in the isle that is called Patmos; an exile for the word of God and the testimony of Jesus. But his thoughts were not of himself and his own evil condition. When St. Paul lay in prison at Rome he wrote a letter to the Church in Philippi, and told them that always in every prayer of his he made supplication for *them*. So St. John, thinking not of himself but of the seven churches in Asia which he knew, sends them a letter, and opens with the usual greeting. The greeting is, 'Grace to you and peace, from him which is and which was and which is to come; and from the seven Spirits which are before his throne; and from Jesus Christ, who is the faithful witness, the firstborn of the dead, and the ruler of the kings of the earth.' But the moment that John names the name of Christ he breaks forth into a doxology or hymn of praise. Our text is that doxology.

#### THE LANGUAGE.

There are four phrases that have to be looked at.

1. 'Unto him that loved us.' The Revised Version has 'that loveth us'; and there is no doubt the Revised Version is correct. Manuscript authority is with it; and although on the face of it one might think the tense here should be the same as in the next phrase, it is more after St. John's manner to bring out a contrast between

the finished act of redemption ('he washed us') and the love that abides for ever ('he loveth us').

2. 'And washed us from our sins in his own blood.' R.V., 'And loosed us from our sins by his blood.' It is not quite so certain that the R.V. is right here. The manuscripts are more equally divided, although the authority for 'loosed' is better. Much depends upon the preposition. If the Greek preposition (*ἐν*) has the Greek meaning of *in*, then 'washed' is more likely. But the language has a strong Hebrew flavour; and if the preposition is used in the Hebrew sense of *by*, to denote the price, then 'loosed' is more likely. And as there is only a letter of difference between the two Greek words (*λούσαντι*, 'washed,' *λύσαντι*, 'loosed'), the change might easily be made from the one to the other.

3. 'And made us kings and priests.' The Greek is, 'And he made us a kingdom, priests.' St. John is quoting, or at any rate recollecting, Ex 19<sup>6</sup>, 'Ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests.' The same passage is quoted in 1 P 2<sup>9</sup>, where the translation is 'a royal priesthood.' But that will not do here, because both Greek words are different. The two words 'kingdom, priests' are here simply set down side by side.

4. 'Unto God and his Father.' Once more the Revised Version is different—'unto his God and Father.' The Greek is literally 'Unto the God and Father of him'; and although the translation of the A.V. is possible, the translation of the R.V. is much more agreeable to the grammar.

#### THE THOUGHTS.

These four phrases introduce the four thoughts which are contained in the text.



1. *Unto him that loveth us.* (1) Him that loves us always: it is the present tense of duration. Yet it is not exactly the same as 'God is love.' That is a description of the nature or character of God, and it is timeless. St. John's thoughts of Jesus Christ are rather of a series of acts manifesting love, bringing it out in action, so that we see it, and know it, and profit by it. He did love when He came and died; He does love in being with us always and in interceding for us; He will love in reigning amongst us for ever.<sup>1</sup> (2) Nor is it the same as 'God so loved the world.' No doubt God loved the world, and loves it still. But here it is *us*, the forgiven, the restored, the redeemed. There are three ways of it. Love has a circumference, an inner circle, and a centre. God loved the world; that is the circumference. That is the love which causes the sun to shine on the just, and also on the unjust. Christ loved the Church; that is the inner circle. It is narrower; it is more select, if you will; it includes the return of love, and the sanctification of the Church, so that she may be a bride adorned for the bridegroom. But there is a centre to this circle. It is the love of Jesus for an individual. We have it in Jn 11<sup>5</sup>, 'Now Jesus loved Martha, and her sister; and Lazarus.' We see it best on earth in the love of the mother for her child. For it is a love of absolute, unselfish sacrifice, and it is spent not upon the Church universal, but upon the individual person—'I have loved *thee* with an everlasting love.'<sup>2</sup>

Norman Macleod in his *Highland Parish* tells a wonderful story of love's redemptive sacrifice. Years ago a Highland widow, unable to pay her rent, was threatened with eviction. She set out, with her only child, to walk ten miles over the mountains to the home of a relative. When she started the weather was warm and bright, for the month was May, but before she reached the home of her friend a terrible snowstorm fell upon the hills. She did not reach her destination, and next day a dozen strong men started to search for her. At the summit of the pass where the storm had been the fiercest they found her in the snow, stripped almost to nakedness, dead. In a sheltering nook they found the child, safe and well, wrapped in the garments the mother had taken from her own body. Years afterwards the son of the minister who had conducted the mother's funeral went to Glasgow to preach a preparatory sermon. The night was stormy and the audience small. The snow and the storm recalled to his mind the story he had often heard his father tell, and, abandoning his prepared sermon, he told the story

of a mother's love. Some days after he was hastily summoned to the bed of a dying man. The man was a stranger to him, but seizing the minister's hand he said, 'You do not know me, but I know you, and knew your father before you. Although I have lived in Glasgow many years, I have never attended a church. The other day I happened to pass your door as the snow came down. I heard the singing and slipped into a back seat. There I heard the story of the widow and her son.' The man's voice choked and he cried, 'I am that son. Never did I forget my mother's love, but I never saw the love of Christ in giving Himself for me until now. It was God made you tell that story. My mother did not die in vain. Her prayer is answered.'

2. *And loosed us from our sins by his blood.* St. John knows that Christ loveth us not simply because that is His nature, but because He has shown, is showing, and will show His love in deeds. This is the great deed done in the past. He loosed us from our sins. He made them fall off us as Peter's chains fell off him at the angel's word. This is (1) a fact in history. It occurred in a certain place, at a certain time in the history of the world. There was a certain moment when Jesus said, 'It is finished.' At that moment the veil of the temple was rent and the Kingdom of Heaven was opened to all believers. It is a fact in history with extraordinary results. John did not know at the time what the results were; afterwards he was able to say, 'We have known and we have believed the love.' It was (2) a costly act. 'He loosed us from our sins *by his blood*.' When He was upon the Cross they said, 'Come down, and we will believe thee.' Possibly St. John himself said that in his heart. But now he believes because He did not come down. To have come down from the cross would have cost Him nothing. By not coming down He lost his own life, but He gained both our life and our love. Dying, He bore much fruit.

A few years ago, the following incident happened, showing to what lengths love will go to secure the advancement of the beloved. A woman in Vienna died of blood poisoning. After inquiry it was found that she was a widow, a seamstress with one son, who earned her living by sewing. The son, a medical student, had that very week been passing successfully a series of examinations which would have rendered him able to aid his mother henceforth. Up till then she had worked hard to keep them both, and to provide him with a good education, with which to take his place in life. In order that he might go from the house morning after morning to sit for his examinations with a quiet mind, she had hidden the injury to her finger from him. A surgeon whom she had seen warned her of the consequences of delay, but not till the son had gone from her to the college, the last morning, would she hear of going to bed, or of an operation.

<sup>1</sup> See J. H. Jowett, *Apostolic Optimism*, 1901, p. 237.

<sup>2</sup> See Canon Hoare, *Fruitful or Fruitless*, p. 137.



That day, amputation was performed, but too late. The son returned to impart the good news to her with elation, only to find her dying. But it was enough, he was promoted.

3. *And He made us a kingdom, priests.* He made us (1) a kingdom by His decease (His 'exodus,' as it is called in the account of the Transfiguration), just as Jehovah made Israel a kingdom by the exodus from Egypt. He made us a kingdom, with Himself as King—"to him be the glory and the dominion." A willing people in thy day of power shall come to thee. But it is quite likely that St. John means further that He made us kings, in fact a kingdom of kings, so that we shall reign with Him while He still reigns over us. And how is a kingdom of kings to be recognized? Just in this way, that each king is under authority, delights to do the will of the King of kings; has himself first well in hand, and then issues his orders. (2) And how do the members of this kingdom show themselves to be kings? By showing themselves to be priests. The priest is a minister. He comes not to be ministered unto, but to minister. He comes, he also, to give his life a ransom.

The essence of the priest is that he should believe himself, however humbly and secretly, to be set in a certain sense between humanity and God. . . . He feels that he stands, like Aaron, to make atonement; . . . In the hands of a perfectly humble, perfectly disinterested man, this may become a very beautiful and tender thing. Such a man from long and intimate relations with humanity, will have a very deep knowledge of the human heart. He will be surprised at no weakness or frailty; he will be patient with all perverseness and obduracy; he will be endlessly compassionate, because he will realize the strength and insistence of temptation; he will be endlessly hopeful, because he will have seen a hundred times over the flower of virtue and love blooming in an arid and desolate heart. He will have seen close at hand the transforming power of faith, even in natures which have become the shuddering victims of evil habit.<sup>1</sup>

4. *He made us a kingdom, priests, to his God and Father.* A kingdom to God? Yes, He had received us from God, and He kept us and gave us back to God with the new dignity of kings, with the new devotion of priests. But what God? His God and Father. (1) For if He is not ashamed

to call them brethren, neither is He ashamed to call God His God. 'My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?'—that was in the hour of anguish. Now in the hour of joy, God is still His God. (2) But His God is His Father. This is quite as wonderful. When He was upon earth He was known as a man under authority. He was under authority to a Father—"Oh, my Father, not my will, but thine be done." And so we also are a kingdom and priests to a God who is a Father. 'Fear not, little flock, your Father knoweth.'

#### THE CONCLUSION.

'Unto him that loveth us, and loosed us from our sins by his blood . . . to him be the glory and the dominion for ever and ever. Amen.' So, however mighty we become as kings, however helpful our ministry becomes as the ministry of priests, the dominion is not ours, nor the glory. Not unto us, not unto us. To Him be the glory and the dominion right on to the end.

'You remember that exquisite story of Ian Maclaren's—the story of the old doctor come to his death-bed. Dr. Maclure had lived a life of splendid service, and the only text for his tomb seemed, "Greater love hath no man than this, that he lay down his life for his friend." He lay on his bed dying, and he called his old friend, a Scotchman, to him. They had never talked on religion to each other. They kept up a very strong reserve. Though sometimes their souls had touched, their words had never touched. Very quietly the old doctor said, "Will you read for me from the Bible?" And his friend, remembering what he had read to his dying mother, opened the Bible at the fourteenth chapter of St. John's Gospel, and began, "In my Father's house are many mansions." The doctor stopped' him.

"'It's a bonnie word, an' yer mither wes a sanct; but it's no for the like o' me. It's ower gude; a' daurna tak it. Shut the buik an' let it open itsel', an' ye'll get a bit a've been readin' ev'ry nicht the laist month.'"

"Then his friend opened it again and found the story of the publican standing afar off, who would not so much as lift up his eyes to heaven, but smote upon his breast, and said, "God be merciful to me a sinner."

"That micht hae been written for me or ony ither auld sinner that hes feenished his life, an' hes naething tae say for himsel'," said the doctor."<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> A. C. Benson, *From a College Window*, p. 216.

<sup>2</sup> See J. Ernest Rattenbury, *Six Sermons on Social Subjects*, p. 101.



## The Religious-Historical Movement in German Theology.

BY THE REV. J. M. SHAW, M.A., EDINBURGH.

### III.

It is when we come to the distinctive work of the school or movement in the field of *apologetic* and *systematic theology*, that we see most clearly the importance of the personal relation to the Christian facts. Here, indeed, the determinative character of the personal religious convictions or value-judgments of the investigator is explicitly recognized by Troeltsch and those who, like him, endeavour to 'think things together.' But the presence of such a factor, they hold, does not interfere with the properly scientific character of their theology. The all-important question, according to Troeltsch, is: What is the source or basis of these personal convictions or value-judgments? According as they are based—as in the old Church theology—on the consideration of Christianity in its isolation, as the one true religion with its asserted unique supernatural origin and character, or on the study of religious history as a whole in which Christianity is only one among other religions, so will the resulting theology be *dogmatic* or *scientific*. The essence of the scientific method is that 'it relativizes everything,' in the sense of viewing every phenomenon of history in its connexion with similar or analogous phenomena elsewhere, and finally with the whole.<sup>1</sup>

It has been objected, by Warneck<sup>2</sup> and others, that the result of the application of this relativizing historical method is to deny Revelation altogether, and to reduce the whole history of religion to 'a mere play of subjective representations and needs.' That, however, is contrary at once to the aim, and to the most explicit assertions of Troeltsch, Bousset, and others. What they do energetically deny is, that divine revelation is restricted, as the old supernatural theology maintained, to one section of religious history, viz. to Christianity

and its Old Testament preparation. This were to divide the history of religion into two disparate halves, introducing a distinction not merely of degree but of kind; and that, however, they say, is a contradiction of the very idea of historical thinking, with its fundamental principle of correlativity. The result of the study of comparative religion, and of the consistent carrying out of the religious-historical method in apologetic is, rather, they claim, to show: (1) that *every* religion, so far as it is living, if in a sense 'natural' and human as the outcome of human needs and necessities, is still rooted in divine revelation—the outcome of the contact of the human with the living Divine Spirit—and is in that sense 'supernatural'; and (2) that in the history of religion we have no chaos of human representations of, or fancies about, the Divine, but a process in which 'on the whole' (*im Grossen und Ganzen*),<sup>3</sup> spite of many periods of stagnation and retrogression, we see an ordered progressive revelation of God to the spirit of man which reaches its highest point in the Christian religion. 'The whole history of the religious life of mankind stands to us,' says Bousset,<sup>4</sup> 'as the great handiwork of God, a ceaseless aspiration and constant intercourse of God with man, of man with his Maker, in accordance with the stage of civilization to which he has attained.' The *supernatural*, that is to say, is not restricted to *one point* of history. The religion of the Old and New Testaments, indeed, represents the purest form which religion has reached. But Christianity is not the only religion. It is simply the most complete species of the genus. And just as it is from a comparative study of anatomy that we see most clearly the highly developed character of the organism of man, so it is from a comparative study of religions that we learn most thoroughly and completely to understand and appreciate the worth of the Christian religion. The fundamental proof of Christianity, therefore,

<sup>1</sup> 'Erst ihre Zusammenschau im Ganzen eine Beurteilung und Bewertung ermöglicht' (Troeltsch, *Die Absolutheit des Christentums*, p. 53).

<sup>2</sup> In his *Missionsmotiv u. Missionsaufgabe nach d. modernen religionsgesch. Schule*, 1907.

<sup>3</sup> Bousset, *Die Mission u. d. sogenannte religionsgesch. Schule*, p. 22.

<sup>4</sup> *What is Religion?* p. 9.



it is claimed, is the religious-historical or comparative. Only when Christianity is studied as a section of the general history of religion, and in relation to other religions, by the comparative method is its proper nature and worth aright realized.

Now the significance of the new comparative study of religions, alike for our conception of Christianity and for our attitude to non-Christian religions, it would be difficult to overestimate.

To begin with, (a) our fuller knowledge of religions outside the Christian has led to an enlarging of our views of the ways of God with man. We see how God has never left Himself without a witness, how through the whole religious family of mankind God has been working—no transcendent deistic God who, having at the first implanted in man certain religious conceptions, left him to himself, and has subsequently intervened in the process only at one point, to right the wrong caused by sin and the fall. As against the old external supernaturalism, Troeltsch's contention<sup>1</sup> is amply justified that Christianity is but the fulfilment of a religious ideal which manifests itself less or more perfectly in all existing religions. Not only within the nature of man have we a preparation for Christianity—the *anima naturaliter Christiana*,—in history also we see a providential preparation for the consummating purpose of the ages. Christianity came not as something fallen from heaven, 'a bolt from the blue,' a revelation isolated and unrelated. Rather should we say with Pfeiderer,<sup>2</sup> it came as 'the ripe fruit of ages of development in a soil that was already prepared.' This is but to express in different words the apostolic teaching, that the Father sent forth His Son in the fullness of time when, not only in ethical and spiritual yearning, but in language, thought, and civilization, the world lay ready for Him. So it need not surprise us if in the Gentile world we find adumbrations, even of what we were fain to believe were peculiar Christian conceptions. In the world of Gentile thought as well as Jewish, Christ had His forerunners preparing the way for Him. 'God's manifestations,' as A. B. Davidson says somewhere, 'are never sudden—outposts and skirmishers precede the array of the Lord of

Hosts.' Thus comparative religion has its part to play in the full proof of the truth of Christianity; for this proof is not complete until other religions are seen to have their fulfilment in it. He knows not the Christian religion aright who knows the Christian religion alone.

(b) And this altered conception of the extent and nature of the working of God in history demands in turn an altered conception of the missionary task. No longer can forms of faith and practice outside Christianity be denied the name of religion, and indiscriminately labelled 'illusions' 'superstitions,' 'a homogeneous mass of human error.'<sup>3</sup> No longer can missions to non-Christian peoples or races be regarded in the light of *expeditions* sent forth with the primary object of conquest and defeat. 'Not to destroy, but to fulfil,' must be the missionary motto of the twentieth century. Therefore the urgent need to-day, at once for the missionary and for the Christian apologist, of a more serious study of ethnic religions, with a view to a worthier realization of the spiritual truths on which they are based and which afford their point of contact for Him who is the Truth in whom all truths meet. Too long has Christianity been presented to the Eastern mind as an exotic, as a plant of foreign growth—a product of Western thought and language. Rather must Christianity come to the East, in terms of Eastern thought and life, as the continuation and fulfilment of whatever there is in it of religious truth and reality. And God's providential working in history may be seen in the fact that the meeting of East and West in this generation is contemporaneous with a truer understanding of the *historical* Jesus, very Man of very Man—who is neither Eastern nor Western, because He is large enough to embrace both.

But however the *form* of Christian apologetic and missionary endeavour may change, the motive and impulse remain the same, viz. the conviction that in Christ we have the absolute Revelation, in such a sense that we can say, 'God is in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself.' With this conviction Christianity stands or falls; and the business of Christian apologetic and theology is to interpret and justify the claim. Belief in Christianity, and in Christ, as the 'absolute Revelation of God, however, is, according to Troeltsch, but a subjective faith or conviction

<sup>1</sup> 'Geschichte u. Metaphysik,' *Z. Th. K.*, viii. p. 1 f., and elsewhere.

<sup>2</sup> *Early Christian Conception of Christ*, p. 152.

<sup>3</sup> See Troeltsch, *Die Absolutheit*, p. 4.

which cannot be proved by the religious-historical method. Indeed, the question of the *absoluteness* of the Christian religion is, he holds, not a question for *scientific* investigation or proof at all. The comparative study of religions shows what are the essential needs and desires of the religious nature, and makes it improbable that any other religion will arise to satisfy these better than Christianity. But from the purely scientific historical standpoint the most that we can say is, that the Christian religion is the highest that has yet appeared on the plane of history. The conviction that it is not only the relatively highest but the *absolutely* highest or final religion—in the sense that there can be no higher—this the historical method cannot justify, and so it must remain a merely *subjective* personal conviction. It is a faith lying ‘*jenseits der Wissenschaft*.’ Even this position, however,—that Christianity is the relatively highest,—while too little for faith turns out to be itself too much for the scientific method. For when pressed, Troeltsch,<sup>1</sup> Bousset,<sup>2</sup> and others have to admit that, even if based on a wide survey of general religious history and a comparison of Christianity with other religions, and in this sense ‘objective,’ this conviction is in the last resort an ‘*axiomatische Tat*’—the result not so much of objective, scientific, historical examination as of personal experience of the saving significance of the revelation of God in Jesus Christ. It is a faith-judgment, therefore, not so much to be scientifically proved as to be experimentally verified. You cannot prove to an unbeliever, as Herrmann says, the truth, even the relative truth, of the Christian religion.

For the proof of Christianity, then, even as the *relatively* highest historical religion, the purely scientific, historical method is, on Troeltsch’s and Bousset’s own concessions, not the final or adequate proof. Its place is not first, but second and supplementary, ‘a subsequent verification and confirmation of a conviction already possessed.’<sup>3</sup> Why then, it may be reasonably asked, limit faith to the affirmation of Christianity as the relatively highest? If even so much goes beyond the power of scientific proof, on what ground take exception—as exception is taken

—to the traditional view as to the absoluteness of Christianity and of Jesus Christ?

For an answer to this question, and for an understanding of the characteristic position of the school, we are carried ultimately behind the scientific, historical method as such—whose right as a regulative method is unquestioned (though certain exaggerations have attended the enthusiasm of its first application which later investigation must correct)—to the *motif* or purpose which governs their particular application of the method.

Conscious of the ugly gulf there is, in Germany more than here, between the Church and the cultured classes, this ‘school’ or movement has set itself to the attempt to win again for the gospel those whom the Church, by its doctrinal and ecclesiastical formulation of Christianity, has largely alienated. Luther and the Reformation had called the people back from ecclesiastical authority and the externalism of the Mediæval Church to the Christianity of Paul, and in this had taken a great step towards return to the spiritual simplicity of the Christian Religion. But the progress of modern thought, it is held, has shown that much of the traditional Church formulation is no longer of permanent value, inasmuch as it is founded on a view of Jesus—His Person and work—which modern historical criticism, as guided by the thought of evolution, has shown to be untenable.

The crying need of the time, therefore, they maintain, is to cut ourselves loose from the traditional formulation, and give a ‘scientific’ restatement of the gospel—a restatement of it, that is, in terms of ‘modern culture.’ Accordingly the members of the religious-historical school come before us as leaders of a new Reformation—leaders of the world back to the true original gospel of Jesus. And in this capacity they come forth from their academic retirement and make their appeal to the people.

Besides a new popular commentary, with fresh translations and introductions, on the books of the N.T., under the editorship of Johannes Weiss (formerly of Marburg, now of Heidelberg), the chief organs of the movement in this its popular appeal are two: (1) a series of ‘Popular Tracts on Religious History’ (*religionsgeschichtliche Volksbücher*), edited by Schiele of Tübingen, at an average cost of sixpence; and (2) a larger and more expensive series entitled ‘Vital Questions’ (*Lebensfragen*), edited by Weinel of Jena.

The fundamental achievement of this new

<sup>1</sup> *Die Absolutheit*, p. 61, *et passim*.

<sup>2</sup> *Die Mission u. d. sogenannte Religionsgesch. Schule*, p. 18.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 20 n.



'scientific' theology is represented as being the discovery of an antithesis or cleft between Jesus and Paul—between the teaching of Jesus and the Christian religion as formulated by Paul (and afterwards by John). The several members of the school differ as to the extent of the cleft. Weinle, Wernle, and others admit that Paul in many respects understood and interpreted the meaning and significance of the historical Jesus and His teaching better than any other of the apostles; especially in completing the process of the universalizing of the gospel, freeing it from the fetters of national observance and ceremony, and converting it into a world-wide religion. According to Wrede, on the other hand,—and one feels more consistently,—Paul has no claim to be considered a follower of Jesus. He is essentially a new phenomenon, 'as new,' he says, 'as could possibly be.'<sup>1</sup> He even asserts that Paul 'stands much further from Jesus than Jesus Himself stands from the noblest figures of Jewish piety.'<sup>2</sup> Amid differences in detail, however, the common position is that in Paul the simple gospel of Jesus experienced such an alteration of its character that he must be considered the founder of a new, a different Christianity, or, as Wrede expresses it, 'the second founder of Christianity.'<sup>3</sup>

In two respects especially is this so:

(1) The ethical religion of Sonship to God the Father and obedience to His will, became transformed into a religion of redemption through a supernatural divine Christ.

And (2) Christianity, in this narrower sense, came to partake of a sacramental character which was, in its essence, alien to the purely spiritual gospel of Jesus.

How this came about is indeed historically explicable. (a) To begin with, Paul was a *theologian* before he was a Christian. In his pre-Christian days he was the possessor of a supernatural Messianic Christology, a 'Christusbild,' which he had learned in the Jewish schools, and when Jesus met him in vision on the Damascus road, Paul sought to interpret Him by means of Messianic ideas, which in their origin were quite independent of the historical Jesus. This was, however, to misunderstand the simple gospel of the layman Jesus, and to carry over into the Christian religion much of the old Jewish theology from which Jesus Himself had set people free. The result is that,

instead of the historical Jesus, we are given in Paul an abstract dogmatic picture of a pre-existent Heavenly Being in which we cannot, or at most can with difficulty, recognize the living historical personality of whom the Gospels speak.

(b) So, again, his Soteriology or doctrine of redemption is to be explained by reference to the psychological atmosphere, in which he found himself. The idea of salvation as a redemption from hostile powers that hold man in bondage was in the air, alike in Judaism and in pagan philosophy—redemption through the death and resurrection of a heaven-born hero; and these pre-Christian or extra-Christian speculations were applied to the Jesus of history with whom they have essentially nothing to do.

(c) Finally the Apostle, in his missionary travels, came in contact with pagan ethnic religions which were saturated with a mystery-atmosphere. And with the view of making Christianity intelligible, and acceptable to the people, Paul transferred the physical or quasi-physical sacramental ideas current in the Greek and Oriental mysteries to the spiritual gospel of Jesus to which they were originally alien. This, says Bousset, was 'the tribute which Christianity paid to the heathen world surrounding it.'<sup>1</sup>

The result of the whole is, that in Paul we have a presentation of the Christian faith which is due not in the first place, and not chiefly, to the influence of the historic Jesus, but to factors that are not specifically Christian. The simple gospel of Jesus is complicated by the introduction of views of His Person and work that were not present in the mind of Jesus Himself.

For nearly twenty centuries Christianity in this narrower sense has held sway, less or more. It has been reserved for the close of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth century to *rediscover* the actual human Jesus and His gospel which were 'displaced' or 'crushed out' by the theological heavenly Christ of Paul and the Church. The great task of the scientific investigation of Christianity in the twentieth century, indeed, is to free Jesus and His gospel from theology and the Church—'to save Jesus from the theologians.' And this means first of all from Paul, with whom the elaboration of Christianity into a doctrinal and ecclesiastical system began.

<sup>1</sup> *What is Religion?* p. 247.

<sup>1</sup> *Paul*, p. 165.    <sup>2</sup> *Paul*, p. 165.    <sup>3</sup> *Paul*, p. 179.

## In the Study.

### WHEELS BY THE CHEBAR.

MESSRS. SEELEY have published an account of an Englishwoman's eight years' residence among the women of the East. The title is *Behind the Veil in Persia and Turkish Arabia* (16s. net). The author is the wife of A. Hume-Griffith, M.D., D.P.H., who was with her and who contributes some narratives of his own experience. The book is illustrated by photographs, which are many and good. It is a gossip narrative, without any pretension to anything scientific, whether medical or Biblical. It is just a pleasant narrative of travel, a woman being the traveller, and a woman's sympathy with women the motive of interest. Mrs. Hume-Griffith says in one place: 'Perhaps the Arab women are slow to give their love and trust, but when once given, it is sure and lasting. Often these women have said to me, "Why do you love us, Khatoun?" They cannot understand that any one should care for them. Such an idea is outside the range of their experience altogether. One of the first sentences I learned in the Arabic language was, *Ana ahubkum* ("I love you all"), and this is one of the most useful and necessary phrases to be learnt. Love is the magic key which opens a way to the hearts of the Moslem women, and which brings forth much fruit in return.'

But there are things in the book for the expositor. There is one thing of surpassing interest. Think of the joy it gave one to come unexpectedly upon a most likely explanation of Ezekiel's wheels, and of the visible form of the cherubim, in the course of a woman's unpretentious account of her travels among the women of the Near East.

'We had travelled through a weary stretch of waterless desert that day, and were rejoicing in the fact that our camping-ground for the night was by the banks of a river—the Chebar. Only those who have journeyed for days through a parched-up desert land can tell the joy with which a river is sighted. We experienced something of that joy on the evening when we saw water for the first time for two or three days. We pitched our camp as close to the river as possible, and, sitting at our tent door, prepared to enjoy to the full the beauties before us. Looking up I saw in front of me a

glorious sight. I quickly called my husband, and together we stood and watched this wonderful vision. The sun was sinking as a ball of fire behind the river, when suddenly from its centre there arose beautiful prismatic lights. These gradually resolved themselves into the form of a huge wheel, each spoke of the wheel being of a different colour, merging gradually and almost imperceptibly into the next, as in the rainbow. Within this "wheel" was another and smaller one, also composed of the same prismatic hues. The outer circle of each wheel was formed by a band of bright opaque light. On the top of these wheels was a visionary form resembling the beginning of another wheel, but it was too indistinct for me to say what definite shape it possessed. At either side of these wheels was a large wing, as it were overshadowing the wheels; these were also of a bright white. The whole formed a most wonderful and never-to-be-forgotten sight, and we felt indeed that this was a vision of God.



'When in Mosul, my husband had received a letter from a gentleman in England, asking him to keep a look-out for any such phenomenon as this. On reaching home it was interesting to find, on good authority, that the sight we had seen on the banks of the Khabour was one of historical interest. The form of the wheels is almost identical with the emblem which the Babylonians adopted to represent Divinity. On the same authority I learnt, too, that in all probability a vision similar to this was the origin of the cherubims. It is believed by an expert on the subject that the whole of the



"vision" is caused by atmospheric influences, the sun acting on the particles of frost in the air, thus forming the prismatic colours. Be this as it may, the result was truly marvellous, and we were thankful that we had been privileged to see "the heavens open," revealing this vision of God.

'The whole spectacle could not have lasted more than five minutes, but the sky retained its blaze of colour for about a quarter of an hour after; then darkness covered the heavens.'

#### COMMENTARIES ON THE APOCALYPSE.

In the year 1903 two articles appeared in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES (xiv. 151, 203) on the best Bible Commentaries. They were written by Mr. Henry Bond, Borough Librarian, Woolwich.

When any one called at the library asking for a good commentary, Mr. Bond had difficulty in finding it. It was the word 'good' that troubled him; commentaries were plentiful enough. So he wrote to a number of Old and New Testament students and asked them to say what they thought the best commentary on each book of the Bible. In his articles in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES he gave their recommendations. For the Book of Revelation he named Simcox in the *Cambridge Bible*, and Carpenter in *Ellicott's Commentary*. But since 1903 other commentaries have been published, other and better.

First, and best of all, Swete's *The Apocalypse of St. John* (Macmillan; 15s.)—a wonderful book. Since it was published in 1906 we have used it constantly, and now we are prepared to pass the deliberate judgment that it is equal in insight and expression to anything ever written by Lightfoot, and in fulness of reference to anything ever written by Westcott. A second edition appeared in 1907, and the student must see that he has it. There is also the Commentary by Hort (Macmillan, 1908; 5s.), which unfortunately covers only the first three chapters. And then there is Mr. Dummelow's *One-Volume Bible Commentary* (1909). But it is not part of Mr. Dummelow's plan to name the editors of the various books. It is, of course, very brief. There is also a useful commentary by Professor Weidner of the Lutheran Theological Seminary in Chicago, published by Messrs. Scribner's Sons in 1905.

Mr. Bond's scholars ought to have mentioned

Professor Anderson Scott's little commentary in the *Century Bible* (unfortunately undated, but published in 1902). It is alive from cover to cover, and independent. Professor Scott is also the editor of the Apocalypse in Dr. Robertson Nicoll's *Devotional and Practical Commentary* (Hodder & Stoughton; 5s.), which was published in 1905. Of the older commentaries worth naming are Sadler's (Bell, 1893; 6s.), Cresswell Strange's (Longmans, 1899; 6s.), and, of course, Dean Vaughan's *Lectures* (Macmillan, 1882; 10s. 6d.), which are thoroughly characteristic.

#### IT WAS NOT POSSIBLE.

There is a nationality in sermons as well as a time-spirit. But occasionally a preacher is great enough to rise above the fashion of his own country and preach for the world. Such a preacher is the Rev. Charles H. Parkhurst of the Presbyterian Church in New York. His books are often found in British studies. His latest book is his best—*A Little Lower than the Angels* (Revell; 3s. 6d. net). It contains twenty fairly long sermons, every one of them facing the real facts of life, but, in spite of that, courageous and inspiring. For Dr. Parkhurst's faith is the faith of the Apostle John; he knows and he also believes. And he is never tempted into trifling literary or philosophical side issues. The last sermon has the striking title of 'The Duel fought out in the Lord's Grave.' Its text is 'Whom God hath raised up, having loosed the pains of death; because it was not possible that he should be holden of it.' (Ac 2<sup>24</sup>). Dr. Parkhurst prints the word 'possible' in capitals, and then tells this story:—

'There was shown to me a few days ago by a friend, personally familiar with the scene portrayed, the picture of a grave in the cemetery of Hanover, Germany. It was the grave of a woman who lived in the time of Strauss the sceptic, who had been influenced by his teachings, had become antagonistic to the doctrine of the resurrection, but who from lingering suspicion that that doctrine might be true, left instructions in her will that upon the occasion of her death her entombment should be made so secure that the resurrection could not reach her. There was accordingly piled upon her grave, one upon another, massive slabs of marble and granite, sufficient, it would seem, to

protect her body from the disturbance of earthquake, and so deeply immured as to leave her ashes quite beyond the reach of the last trump. And not only was there all this accumulation of cemented masonry, but the superincumbent layers were bound to those underneath by clasps of steel, so that the entire pile had secured to it almost the solidity of native rock.

'Unfortunately, however, for the hopes of the suspicious lady, an atom of vegetable life got covered up underneath the imposed masonry, and a little shrub, nourished, we should like to suppose, by the decayed materials of her own body, commenced to grow, and with that instinctive impulse common to all plant life began to try to find its way out into the light and air. And as against the irresistibility of that bit of young vegetable omnipotency, artificial masonry did not count. Seams began to open themselves along the lines of original cleavage. The clasps by which the planks and blocks of stone had been knit together resisted the strain, till the energy of life came to the full assertion of its power and wrenched the clasps from their sockets, and pushed the slabs off from the path of its own victorious progress. And those slabs lie there to-day in a condition of beautiful disruption, with the full-grown tree standing in their midst, in quiet sarcasm upon the anti-resurrection ambition of the buried woman, and in a verdant eulogy upon the irresistibility of life.'

## THE PAST AND THE FUTURE.

(Materials for the study of Phil. iii. 13, 14.)

'This one thing I do, forgetting the things which are behind, and stretching forward to the things which are before, I press on toward the goal unto the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus.'

1. He had found a purpose in life. The life of man is a vagrant changeful desultoriness; like that of children sporting on an enamelled meadow, chasing now a painted butterfly, which loses its charm by being caught—now a wreath of mist, which falls damp upon the hand with disappointment—now a feather of thistle-down, which is crushed in the grasp. In the midst of all this fickleness, St. Paul had found a purpose to which he gave the undivided energy of his soul. 'This one thing I do.'<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> F. W. Robertson, *Sermons*, i. 58.

Back flies the foam; the hoisted flag streams back;  
The long smoke wavers on the homeward track;  
Back fly with winds things which the winds obey:  
The good ship follows its appointed way.

2. Had he found his life's purpose himself, or had it been given him? Partly both. He had, however, found himself first. He had said, 'I will arise and go.' Then he found that he had already been found by Christ—'I have been apprehended.' Now his discovery is that, when he was found, it was for a further purpose, and that, again, he must co-operate with God in attaining it—'that I may apprehend that for which also I was apprehended.' Throughout, God and he have been at work, and will be.

3. What is his purpose? To reach the goal and gain the prize. Life is a race: he a runner. There is a *goal*. It is likeness to Christ—that he may think as Christ thinks, speak as Christ speaks, go about doing good as Christ, and delight to do the Father's will. It is a great purpose in life, the only purpose that makes life worth living. And then there is a *reward*—the runner's prize. It is laid up in heaven, a crown of life that fadeth not away, right of entry to the Tree of Life in the new Paradise, the 'well done' of the Father.

4. How is he to accomplish his purpose? This is the theme of the text. His method is to forget the things that are behind, and to stretch forward to the things that are before.

### A. Forgetting the things which are behind.

#### I. This is a universal law of progress.

This oblivion of the past is a forgetfulness with which we are familiar in other departments of life. When an artist begins a new picture, he seeks to forget all those he has already painted. For, as long as he is haunted by the memory even of his best work, he can achieve only a limited success, perhaps only repeat his former ideas. He must paint with his eye on what he is doing, not on what he has done.<sup>2</sup>

Mr. Story, the sculptor, was once showing his work to a friend who was visiting him. 'For which of the things you have done,' asked his friend, 'do you care most?' 'I care most,' was the answer, 'for the statue I am to carve next.'<sup>3</sup>

There is a touching story told of a modern sculptor, who was found standing in front of his masterpiece, sunk in sad reverie. When they asked him why he was so sad, 'Because,' he answered, 'I am satisfied with it.'<sup>4</sup>

This is a principle of which the application can be traced

<sup>2</sup> F. B. Macnutt, *The Riches of Christ*, p. 29.

<sup>3</sup> S. Law Wilson, *Helpful Words for Daily Life*, p. 258.

<sup>4</sup> A. Maclaren, *Sermons Preached in Manchester*, ii. p. 243.



all through the natural life. The blossom is not regretted when fruit is hardening in its place, nor the slender grace of the sapling when you have got instead the heart of oak, nor the green blade when the ear is bending down in yellow ripeness. So in the spiritual life we have not to mourn over the loss of simplicity if we have got instead souls indurated by experience, disciplined even by fall to refuse the evil and to choose the good.<sup>1</sup>

A while ago the *Lancet* contained an article under the title of 'The First Lesson of Scientific Education,' which sought to expose the folly of wasting mental tissue and energy in useless regrets.<sup>2</sup>

Recently M. Albert Vandal of the French Academy, eulogized a distinguished family because 'it had lived with its time and never shut itself up in the mausoleum of its souvenirs and its regrets.'<sup>3</sup>

It is said that the Sultans of Turkey still imitate the signature of the illiterate Amurath. 'The Arabic letters of their name and style are interwoven into a rude outline of the impression of a human hand, in remembrance of the way in which Amurath, like the shepherd kings of Tartary, the Mongol conquerors, and Timour, ratified his treaties, by dipping his palm in the ink and leaving the print of it on the instrument.'<sup>4</sup>

2. What, then, are the things that are behind which are to be forgotten by St. Paul?

They are, says Lightfoot, 'the portion of the course already traversed.' To which Vincent adds, 'not his experience as a persecutor.'

The things behind which he forgets, says Liddon, are not merely the external prerogatives of Judaism. As the metaphor itself would suggest, they are the earlier struggles, the past experiences, the incomplete attainments of the Christian.<sup>5</sup>

3. What are the things behind which are to be forgotten by us? (1) The days of innocence. Early innocence (the word is used popularly) is nothing more than ignorance of evil. In regretting it there is much that is feeble and sentimental. Human innocence is not to know evil; Christian saintliness is to prefer good. Parents may prolong the duration of innocence unnaturally. (2) The days of youth. In middle life a man is apt to look back, and marvel with a kind of remorseful feeling that he let the days of youth go by only half enjoyed. It is a natural feeling, but it is not Christian. Manhood is a better thing than boyhood because it is a riper thing; and old age ought to be a better thing than manhood. There

comes in age a love more pure and deep than the boy could ever feel; there comes a conviction, with a strength beyond that which the boy could ever know: that the earliest lesson of life is infinite—*Christ is all*. (3) Past errors. The self-accusing temper that is always looking back hinders growth in godliness. There have been mistakes, perhaps irreparable ones. It is not by regretting what is irreparable that true work is done, but by making the best of what we are. (4) Past guilt. Remorse has done more harm than even hardihood. It fixed Judas in an unalterable destiny; it filled the monasteries with useless lives. Remorse paralyses our energies for Christ's work. Break a Christian spirit and it is all over with progress. 'Hath no man condemned thee?' 'No man, Lord.' 'Neither do I condemn thee; go, and sin no more.' 'We must all die,' said the wise woman of Tekoah, 'and are as water spilt upon the ground which cannot be gathered up again.'<sup>6</sup>

When remedies are past, the griefs are ended,  
By seeing the worst, which late on hopes depended.  
To mourn a mischief that is past and gone  
Is the next way to draw the mischief on.  
The robbed that smiles steals something from the thief;

He robs himself that spends a bootless grief.

4. Mistaken remembrance of the past may take the form either of unavailing regrets or of unavailing remorse.

1. *Unavailing regrets*.—These may be (1) for a vanished prosperity. A young poet, who had got into trouble, and enlisted in the army, wrote over the manger of his troop horse, '*Eheu quam infortunii miserrimum est, fuisse felicem*.' (2) Repining over the lost strength and brightness of youth. 'What can I do for you?' asked a friend of the satirist Wolcott, when he lay dying. 'Give me back my youth,' groaned the unhappy man. Come back, come back, is such men's cry. (3) Unavailing anguish for the lost beloved. Some are ever sighing—

But oh, for the touch of a vanished hand,  
And the sound of a voice that is still.

If their sun has set, 'God is always in the meridian.' And their sun has set to rise again.

Thou unrelenting past  
Strong are the barriers round thy dark domain:  
And fetters strong and fast  
Hold all that enter thine unbreathing reign.

<sup>6</sup> F. W. Robertson, *Sermons*, i. 61.

<sup>1</sup> C. R. D. Biggs, *Philippians*, p. 148.

<sup>2</sup> W. L. Watkinson, *Themes for Hours of Meditation*, p. 12.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid*.

<sup>4</sup> Church, *Miscellaneous Essays*, p. 363.

<sup>5</sup> *University Sermons*, p. 127.

Thou hast my better years,  
 Thou hast my earlier friends, the good, the kind,  
 Yielded to thee with tears;  
 The venerable form, the exalted mind,  
 Thine for a space are they:—  
 Yet thou shalt yield thy treasures up at last:  
 Thy gates shall yet give way,  
 Thy bolts shall fall—inexorable past.

2. *Unavailing remorse.*—We cannot alter the guilty past. Not one deed of it.

The moving finger writes, and, having writ,  
 Moves on; nor all thy piety and wit  
 Can lure it back to cancel half a line,  
 Nor all thy tears wash out one word of it.

But though we cannot undo the past, we can repair it. We can repent of our past sins and forsake them. And the Son of Man hath power even on earth to forgive sins. Then we can say, 'The old things have passed away; behold they have become new.'<sup>1</sup>

5. How are we to regard past sin? The answer is that we should forget it; a truly astonishing answer. It may be misapplied, but the misapplication of a medicine does not destroy its essential value. It may be justified (1) as a counsel of moral sanity. It is not good to brood over past sin. We know to what a prison-house of despair and madness such brooding led so gentle and so pure a spirit as Cowper's. R. L. Stevenson says in one of his prayers, 'Help us with the grace of courage that we be none of us cast down, when we sit lamenting amid the ruins of our happiness or our integrity; touch us with the fire of Thy altar, that we may be up and doing to rebuild our city.' (2) It is also an act of faith. God forgets. He remembers our sins no more against us for ever. The way of faith is to accept forgiveness with no false scruples, to forget the sin which God forgives. (3) It is also the one source of moral progress. We are allowed to forget only on condition that we aspire. Paul forgets the past because he is pressing to the mark. It is also the means of forgetting. Consecrate yourself to the struggle, and in the very act of struggling you will forget the past.<sup>2</sup>

Surely I repent;  
 For what is true repentance but in thought—  
 Not even in inmost thought to think again  
 The sins that made the past so pleasant to us?  
 And I have sworn never to see him more,  
 To see him more.—

TENNYSON, *Guinevere*.

6. Are we to forget all that is behind? Is the past to be blotted out of our remembrance? There are some things which we are not to forget. (1) God's hand in national history. What does that history teach us? That greatness and strength are with those to whom morality, the purity of domestic life, and the honour of God are dear. (2) God's hand in our own individual history. How often do the Psalmists stir up their own souls to remember God's wonders in the past. We are to remember that he hath not 'dealt with us according to our sins, nor rewarded us according to our iniquities.'<sup>3</sup>

B. *Stretching forward to the things which are before.*

Whose hand shall dare to open and explore  
 Those volumes closed and clasped for evermore?  
 Not mine! With reverential feet I pass;  
 I hear a voice that cries, Alas! alas!  
 Whatever hath been written shall remain,  
 Nor be erased, nor written o'er again;  
 The unwritten only still belongs to thee;—  
 Take heed and ponder well what that shall be!

The word translated 'reaching forth' in the A.V. is an exceedingly strong word, implying intense and sustained effort. It is a compound word, so compounded as to give it a maximum of force. It is a picture of the runner as he stretches forward with the intensity of his effort, every fibre stretched towards the goal.<sup>4</sup>

The body of the racer is bent forward, his hand is outstretched towards the goal, and his eye is fastened upon it.<sup>5</sup>

The eye outstrips and draws onward the hand, and the hand the foot.<sup>6</sup>

The word has passed into sporting language, 'the home-stretch.'<sup>7</sup>

The expression shows us in the most vivid way the body of the runner stretched forward as he is nearing the goal, just as he was represented in the lifelike bronze statues of the Olympic victors.<sup>8</sup>

I have read that Spain once stamped on her coins the Pillars of Hercules, and took as her motto *Ne plus ultra*; but when the bold spirit of Columbus passed beyond those Pillars, and discovered the New World, she omitted the *ne* and left *plus ultra*—more beyond.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>3</sup> J. J. S. Perowne, *Sermons*, p. 106.

<sup>4</sup> J. Thomas, *Myrtle Street Pulpit*, iii. 202.

<sup>5</sup> Vincent.

<sup>6</sup> Bengel.

<sup>7</sup> Vincent.

<sup>8</sup> E. Curtius, *Expositor*, vii. iv. 445.

<sup>9</sup> E. Paxton Hood, *C.W.P.* xxii. 237.

<sup>1</sup> F. W. Farrar, *True Religion*, p. 59.

<sup>2</sup> W. J. Dawson, *The Evangelistic Note*, p. 113.



1. Paul's eagerness goes out in two directions: in that of fuller knowledge, and in that of more Christlike character. (1) If our religious life is to have a deep hold upon us it must be great not only to our hearts, but also to our minds. We must be theologians. The 'simplicity of the gospel' is sometimes an excuse for intellectual torpor. (2) To be a theologian is good; to be a saint is better. But sainthood is pressing on, not resting satisfied with attainment. To the end Paul would have to say, 'I count not myself to have apprehended. The very height of the calling was a constant challenge to him to climb the steep ascent.'<sup>1</sup>

2. Liddon has two sermons on this subject, one, in the first volume of his *University Sermons*, entitled 'The Law of Progress'; the other, in *Sermons on Some Words of St. Paul*, entitled 'Religious Progress.' In the University Sermon he says that in our day no rallying cry has gained more prominence, or exerted more power, than the demand for Progress. The most opposite aspirations, aye, the most earnest and determined antagonists, range themselves simultaneously under the banner of Progress. Government, society, art, science, even religion, are in turn challenged, reviewed, judged, in the name of Progress. Even in Oxford, with its tradition of a thousand years overshadowing life in rich and varied memories of the past, the characteristic anathema to apply to any institution or society is to call it reaction. But what is it that we mean by progress? (1) True progress must be the progress of man—of man himself, as distinct from the organization, appliances, or embellishments of his life. (2) It must embrace the whole of human life; it must not consist in the development of a single power or faculty. There is a well-authenticated tradition of an argument between Bishop Horsley and Dr. Cyril Jackson, Dean of Christ Church. They sat late into the night debating the question whether God could be better reached through the exercise of the intellect or of the affections. Unwillingly, but step by step, the Bishop, who advocated the claims of intellect, retreated before the arguments of his friend, till at length he exclaimed, 'Then my whole life has been one great mistake.' (3) True progress must embrace, or at least recognize, the outlying conditions of life. (a) The fact of the Fall. There is indeed

<sup>1</sup> D. Fairweather, *Bound in the Spirit*, p. 287.

the theory of Rousseau (in his *Émile*), that man is born good, but is depraved by society. But that doctrine is now referred to only as a curiosity. (b) The wonderful phenomenon of grace. Grace is a real and active force. It is 'the power that worketh in us' (Eph 3<sup>20</sup>), illuminating the intellect, warming the heart, strengthening the will. (c) The fact of immortality—an eternity beyond the grave, an eternal heaven and an eternal hell.<sup>2</sup>

One is as the Alpine traveller, who sees the mountains soaring into the sky, and can hardly discern where the deep shadowed crags and roseate peaks end, and where the clouds of heaven begin. Surely the awestruck voyager may be excused if, at first, he refuses to believe the geologist, who tells him that these glorious masses are, after all, the hardened mud of primæval seas, or the cooled slag of subterranean furnaces—of one substance with the dullest clay, but raised by inward forces to that place of proud and seemingly inaccessible glory.

Goethe draws a striking picture in *Faust* of his hero standing and gazing on the setting sun. As he watches the slowly sinking orb, he longs for wings to follow it in its course. He longs

To drink its everlasting light,  
The day before him, and behind the night.

For it is implanted in us by nature to strive both forwards and upwards. We never hear the lark singing in heaven, he says, we never watch the soaring of the eagle towards the sun, we never see the crane winging her homeward flight, but we long for the same glorious, heavenward freedom.<sup>3</sup>

Charles Simeon of Cambridge says in one of his last letters, alluding to his still abundant toils, 'I am so near the goal that I cannot help running with all my might.'<sup>4</sup>

The runner does not count the laps he has passed, but the laps that remain.<sup>5</sup>

### 3. Now for the goal and the prize.

Distinguish the mark (A.V.) or goal from the prize. The prize is heaven; the mark is Christ. St. Paul ran 'looking off unto Jesus' (He 12<sup>2</sup>).<sup>6</sup>

\*The mark is reached by the runner's efforts; the prize is the reward of victory. The former stands for 'being made conformable unto Christ's death,' the latter for 'attaining unto the resurrection of the dead'; in other words, the mark is moral likeness to our Lord, while the prize is whatsoever of glory and felicity besides. He may be pleased to bestow on us.

The mark was perfection of character—the prize was blessedness. But the Apostle did not

<sup>2</sup> H. P. Liddon, *University Sermons*, i. p. 25.

<sup>3</sup> J. J. S. Perowne, *Sermons*, p. 116.

<sup>4</sup> Moule.

<sup>5</sup> Chrysostom.

<sup>6</sup> A. C. Price, *Fifty Sermons*, vol. iv. p. 57.

aim at the prize of blessedness, he aimed at the mark of perfectness. In becoming perfect he attained happiness, but his primary aim was not happiness. We may understand this by an illustration. In student life there are those who seek knowledge for its own sake, and there are those who seek it for the sake of the prize, and the honour, and the subsequent success in life that knowledge brings. They who seek knowledge for the sake of a prize are not genuine lovers of knowledge—they love only the rewards of knowledge: had it no honour or substantial advantage connected with it they would be indolent. But while the prize was not St. Paul's aim, it was an incentive. If his step began to flag, the radiant diadem before him gave new vigour to his heart; and we know how, at the close of his career, the vision became more vivid and more entrancing: 'henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of glory.'

In the sphere of conduct the prize is the serviceable life; in the sphere of personal morality, it is the regenerated character.

Life in God's contempt apart,  
With ghastly smooth life dead at heart,  
Tame in earth's paddock as her prize.<sup>1</sup>

4. Why is the prize described as 'the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus'?

Dr. Vaughan is probably right in saying that the force of the phrase 'lies not in the idea of *upward* or *to heaven*, but in that of the Person who calls *being Himself above* or *in heaven*.' But as the Apostle regards the call as taking its character and object from this fact, *heavenly* is

<sup>1</sup> Browning, *Easter Day*, iii.

practically equivalent to *heavenward*. It is that summons or charge which comes to every Christian to make his home in the Jerusalem which is above.<sup>2</sup>

The determining feature in the high calling of the Christian is that it has Christ for its centre. His Word, His Will, is the law of the Christian's action. His sustaining and sanctifying influence pervades the whole of the Church's activity—pervades it in theory, and it is for us to see that it pervades it more and more completely in practice. 'If ye be risen with Christ, seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth at the right hand of God. Set your affection on things above, not on things on the earth. For ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God.'<sup>3</sup>

The calling is not primarily a calling to receive a prize, but to run a race. The calling exists before the race begins. It is the invitation, the sanction, the authority by which the race is begun, the goal fixed, and the prize awarded. The high calling is, in the Epistle to the Hebrews, the heavenly calling.<sup>4</sup>

It is a calling to be perfect; it is therefore not the Apostle's own, but God's. The work began with God. God will see to its accomplishment. It is this that gives his spiritual activity its greatest intensity. The calling is high, but not higher than by God's grace he may attain to. 'I like to think of that strong phrase of Calvin's—*irresistible grace*.'<sup>5</sup>

<sup>2</sup> W. Sanday, *Two Present-Day Questions*, p. 15.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 17.

<sup>4</sup> J. Thomas, *Myrtle Street Pulpit*, iii., 203.

<sup>5</sup> D. Fairweather, *Bound in the Spirit*, p. 289.

## The New Hebrew Bible of the British and Foreign Bible Society.

BY PROFESSOR EBERHARD NESTLE, D.D., MAULBRONN.

To say a word on this new undertaking I am perhaps the more entitled, or even called upon, since my name has been mentioned in connexion with it in a way which must give a wrong impression.

Under the heading 'A New Edition of the Hebrew Bible' there was, in the *Times* of 23rd January, a long correspondence, together with a leader on it.

With the leader the Society was, it seems, not quite satisfied; so the secretaries sent a letter to the *Times* (27th January); whose last paragraph was:

'In order to ensure accuracy the committee have obtained for Dr. Ginsburg the help of three accomplished scholars as *proof-readers*—



Professor Strack of Berlin, Herr Kahan of Leipzig, and Professor Eberhard Nestle of Maulbronn. The Society hopes therefore, within the limits it has been obliged to impose upon Dr. Ginsburg, to secure the best Hebrew Bible which has ever yet been issued in print.'

Finally, there was another letter in the *Times* (10th January) by Dr. E. W. Bullinger, secretary of the Trinitarian Bible Society, stating that the 'New Edition' in question will be precisely the same, as far as the text is concerned, as that prepared by Dr. Ginsburg, and recently published by the Trinitarian Bible Society at an expense of over £2000.

The letter goes on to state that a second edition was lately printed from the plates of the first, which is on sale at greatly reduced prices, and on which royalties continue to be paid. A third edition is being prepared, in which there will be an appendix of several pages of typographical errors.

On the last paragraph of the letter, that it is an open question whether the new edition does not infringe the copyright of the Trinitarian Society, I cannot enter. I have to do here only with the new book and, in passing, with my connexion with it. And there can be no question that the new Hebrew Bible, of which only the first part, the Pentateuch, has appeared as yet, is the most *beautifully printed* Hebrew Bible or even Hebrew Book which I know of, so far as the text is concerned. The types of the apparatus, especially the vowelled types, are not clear enough, to come out well from the stereotype plates. But I am told that in the following parts a better type will be chosen, and, after the completion of the whole, the apparatus of the first part re-set in the new type.

With its broad margins—the book is of the size of 27 : 18, 5 cms.—the pages have a splendid appearance. The Trinitarian Bible, just mentioned, had a very clear print, and likewise the former editions of the B.F.B.S. (by Letteris): it is a pity that Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica* in order to save space chose a type which for many eyes is very trying. All who lay stress on a clear print must now take the new edition.

But is it, as well as the most beautiful, also the most *correct*, and the most up-to-date edition?

Now any one who has to do with printing knows that to print a Hebrew Text with vowels and accents is one of the most difficult tasks that

can be fancied. No doubt great care has been bestowed on the correction, but when I saw the first part (Genesis), which had been distributed to the members of the International Congress of Orientalists at Kopenhagen last year, I at once found several misprints from the first page almost to the last (one of the worst in Gn 49<sup>7</sup> זְלִי for זְלִי). So I wrote to the Society that I should like to go through the pages with the help of my pupils (lads of fourteen to sixteen), to whom I would offer (as I had done on former occasions, for instance, when I corrected the Greek Testament for the Society) 20 Pfennig (twopence ha'penny) for every misprint they were to find. This offer was accepted, but not attended to. I never heard of the edition till I got two copies of the finished book on the 26th January.

In opening the new parts, the very second word in Ex 1<sup>1</sup> turned out to be without accent, and in the last verse but one in Deuteronomy (34<sup>11</sup>) a point was missing: probably both had disappeared from the plates; these were not faults of the proof-readers. But there were also faults overlooked by the correctors; the most interesting one, a wrong Dagesh in Dt 29<sup>14</sup>. For this little dot proves that the Bible of the Trinitarian Society mentioned above had served as printers' copy; but it proved, at the same time, that for the Trinitarian Bible itself, a copy of Letteris' edition had been used for the same purpose; for this misprint is also in Letteris. Not only books have their fates, according to the saying of Terentianus Maurus of old: *habent sua fata libelli*, but also misprints. I beg the reader's pardon for speaking so much about these minutiae, but as the statement of the secretaries, that my help also had been obtained by the Society as proof-reader, devolves some responsibility on myself, I am obliged to state the matters as they were. For the future parts I am promised an opportunity of seeing the proofs *before* the plates are made. Several points I should have arranged differently; how awkward, for instance, to have in the headings, chapters and verses at the inside, and the numbers of the pages at the outside, as if one were to look in a Bible to the pages!

But to come to more important points. The *text* is in the main the same as that of the Trinitarian Bible and that of Kittel's Bible, all reproducing the edition of Jacob B. Chayim's Bible of Venice, 1524–1525.

A new feature is the *apparatus*. Dr. Ginsburg

compared seventy-one MSS and nineteen printed editions from 1482 to 1525. Besides, he quotes for some passages the Samaritan Pentateuch (from which edition?), the Targums—again we miss a statement about the editions used,—the Septuagint, the Vulgate, the collations of Kennicott and De Rossi. To denote these sources by Hebrew letters does not recommend itself: much shorter and clearer are the abbreviations in Haupt's *Sacred Books of the O.T.* and in Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica*; but in an edition issued by the Bible Society which is destined to serve Jewish readers also, perhaps the other way seemed impracticable.

Few readers will be able fully to recognize the amount of labour bestowed on this apparatus, which rises from two lines on the page to fourteen and fifteen. To collate seventy MSS and twenty early editions: what scholar will have the patience necessary for this work? Truly, sincere thanks are due to Dr. Ginsburg and to the Society. But will the result be worth this labour and expense? I fear few scholars will say yes.

If the collations printed at the foot of the pages were complete, then they would be of great value; for then we would know that all Hebrew MSS and editions do not yield any more variants than are here gathered; and to know that would be a gain. But certainly the MSS and editions contain more variants. Leaving aside all accents and vowels, I give but one example of consonants: Ex 2<sup>17</sup> is וישיע printed with plene Yod in the new Ginsburg, while it is defective in Kittel, Letteris, and even in Ginsburg's first edition. The apparatus is silent; from the text we must conclude that all MSS and all editions agree in the *plene* spelling. I do not know why Ginsburg introduced it. I do not even care about these minutiae; I mention this case as an example, to show that the apparatus, rich and valuable as it is, is not complete enough

even for the Massoretic text; and yet the real difficulties begin behind it. For the student, the apparatus of Kittel and of Haupt is much more useful. The *text* in the type of the new Bible, with the apparatus of Haupt and Kittel in a corrected and supplemented form; this would give what the secretaries hope of the present edition: the best Hebrew Bible which has ever yet been issued in print. Meanwhile we are thankful to have here the most beautiful, with an apparatus which in one direction has nothing like it.

*P.S.*—I beg to mention one point more, in which sufficient circumspection has not been used for the convenience of the readers: that is the *chapter division*. The chapter division now common in the Hebrew Bibles has not the slightest historical value, and it was one of the gravest mistakes of the German Bible Revision to take a Hebrew Bible as standard for the chapters. The English Revisers were, in that direction, as in many others, much more equal to their task. They simply remarked on the margin for instance, at Gn 31<sup>55</sup> '[Ch. 32, 1 in Heb.],' at Ex 8<sup>1</sup> '[Ch. 7, 26 in Heb.],' at 8<sup>5</sup> '[Ch. 8, 1 in Heb.].' How can one incur the great costs of producing a new Hebrew Bible without settling these differences? In Ex 20 and Dt 5, Dr. Ginsburg has printed the text of the Ten Commandments three times: once in the text with both accentuations, and then twice separately in the apparatus, according to the Babylonian and Palestinian Jews, giving their respective numberings; but the chapter division of the Christian Bible is withheld from us, and this in the country of Stephen Langton, who was its originator. But I must not take up more space. I trust this point and some others will be attended to in an appendix or at a future revision, but it would have saved much expense, if they had been properly considered beforehand.





Assyrians have been published within recent years, large and small, popular and unpopular, not one of them has succeeded in making the subject so fascinating, without the sacrifice of any fact, or shade of a fact, to the Moloch of popularity.

Of the subjects discussed in the book there is none that is of greater concern than the originality of Yahweh. Israel, we know, was God's peculiar people. But was Yahweh Israel's peculiar God? The following is Professor Rogers's treatment of the subject. It is the very latest and clearest account of a keen controversy.

'In August, 1898, Professor Sayce<sup>1</sup> made the most interesting announcement that he had just discovered upon a small Babylonian text in the British Museum the name *Ja-u-um-ilu*, which he translated "Yahveh is God." The publication of this announcement called forth at once a note from Professor Hommel<sup>2</sup> suggesting the appearance of the same Yau in another Babylonian name. The discovery of Professor Sayce seemed to lie comparatively fallow. It excited interest only among scholars, and produced very little popular stir. But upon January 13, 1902, Professor Friedrich Delitzsch, of the University of Berlin, eminent alike as a scholar, a teacher, and the founder of the greatest school of Assyriologists in the world, delivered a lecture in the *Sing Academie* in Berlin, in the presence of the German Emperor. The lecture was a brilliant exposition of the achievements of Assyriology in casting a valuable light upon the Old Testament. Much of what he said awakened no controversy. It was, indeed, in large part known already, and the interest lay chiefly in the skill of its exposition by a master, who had himself made contributions of enduring quality to the science. But as the lecture went on, Professor Delitzsch spoke of the supposed occurrence of monotheism in Babylonia, and there entered upon a most disputed realm. Then he said: "But, further, through the kindness of the head of the department of Assyrian and Egyptian antiquities at the British Museum, I am able to give a representation of three small clay tablets. What is to be seen on these tablets? I shall be asked. Fragile, broken clay upon which are scratched characters scarcely legible! That is true, no doubt,

yet they are precious for this reason: they can be dated with certainty, they belong to the age of Hammurabi, one in particular to the reign of his father, Sin-muballit. But they are still more precious for another reason: they contain three names which, from the point of view of the history of religion, are of the most far-reaching importance: the names are *Yahwe is God*. Therefore Yahwe, the Existing, the Enduring one (we have reasons for saying that the name may mean this), the one devoid of all change, not like us men, who to-morrow are but a thing of yesterday, but one who, above the starry vault which shines with everlasting regularity, lives and works from generation to generation—this Yahwe was the spiritual possession of those same nomad tribes out of which after a thousand years the children of Israel were to emerge."<sup>3</sup>

'These words led to a controversy, widespread, intense, and sometimes conducted in a very bad temper. All sorts of controversialists<sup>4</sup> entered the field essaying to prove that Delitzsch had either misread or misinterpreted his texts. The matter has finally sifted down to very narrow limits of

<sup>3</sup> Friedrich Delitzsch, *Babel und Bibel*, Erster Vortrag. Fünfte neu durchgesehene Ausgabe, pp. 49, 50. Leipzig, 1905. See the translation of this paragraph by C. H. W. Johns, *Babel and Bible*, pp. 70-72. Two Lectures. London and New York, 1903.

<sup>4</sup> There is no need to enumerate here the extensive list of replies to Delitzsch. The following may be cited as being among the more significant:

Eduard König, *Bibel und Bibel*. Eine kulturgeschichtliche Skizze, 6te Auf. Berlin, 1902.

Karl Budde, *Das Alte Testament und die Ausgrabungen*. Giessen, 1903.

Karl Budde, *Was soll die Gemeinde aus dem Streit um Babel und Bibel lernen?* Tübingen, 1903.

Fritz Hommel, *Die altorientalischen Denkmäler und das Alte Testament*. Eine Erwiderung auf Prof. Fr. Delitzsch's *Babel und Bibel*. Berlin, 1902.

Alfred Jeremias, *Im Kampfe um Babel und Bibel*. Ein Wort zur Verständigung und Abwehr, 3te Auf. Leipzig, 1903.

Samuel Oettli, *Der Kampf um Bibel und Bibel*. Ein religionsgeschichtlicher Vortrag.

Heinrich Zimmern, *Keilinschriften und Bibel*. Berlin, 1903.

C. F. Lehmann, *Babyloniens Kulturmission einst und jetzt*. Leipzig, 1903.

C. Bezold, *Die Babylonisch-assyrischen Keilinschriften und ihre Bedeutung für das Alte Testament*. Tübingen und Leipzig, 1904.

Max Löhr, *Babel und die biblische Urgeschichte*. Breslau, 1903.

Paul Haupt, *Bible and Babel*, Johns Hopkins University Circulars, No. 163, pp. 47-51. Baltimore, 1903.

<sup>1</sup> THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, ix. p. 522. The name was quoted from the tablet Bu. 88-5-12, 329, published in *Cuneiform Texts from Babylonian Tablets*, iv. 27.

<sup>2</sup> THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, x. p. 42, Oct. 1898.



doubt indeed. There can be no doubt that *Ja-u-um-ilu* is to be read "Jau is god"; it is exactly the equivalent of the Biblical name Joel. It may still be granted that a slight doubt exists about the first two of these names. It has been attempted on several sides to show that the first half of these names may be a verb form,<sup>1</sup> and the words therefore are interpreted as meaning "God exists" or "God lives." But there is no such personal name anywhere to be found among the northern Semites, and the explanation is without other support. By far the more natural explanation is that the name is to be interpreted as "Jahweh is god."

'Here, then, is the name Jahweh in use among the Babylonians, at the Hammurabi period, two thousand years before Christ.

'But still further support for the Babylonian use of the name has been provided by the discoveries of Dr. Clay in the Kassite period, about 1500 B.C. He has found the names *Ja-u-bani*, *Ja-u-a*, *Ja-a-u*, *Ja-ai-u*, and even the feminine form *Ja-a-u-tum*. *Ja-u-bani* means "Jau is creator," and is formed exactly as *Ilu-bani* ("Ilu is creator"), and *Shamash-bani* ("Shamash is creator"). Here, then, is positive proof that the Babylonians were accustomed to the use of the divine name Jau, or Jahweh, during the period from 2000 B.C. to 1400 B.C.<sup>2</sup>

'Outside of Babylonia the divine name Jahweh has also been found. Upon a letter discovered at Ta'anek, above the plain of Esdraelon, and written about 1450 B.C., there occurs the name *Akhi-ja-mi*,<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The attempt to show that the reading is incorrect, and that the first two should be read *Ya'-a-bi-lu* (so, for example, by Bezold in a very interesting note, *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*, xvi. pp. 415 ff.) must be regarded as a failure. The reading is certain, the only possible doubt concerns the interpretation.

<sup>2</sup> A name Lipush-e-a-um occurs as the name of a daughter of Naram-Sin, and granddaughter of Sargon I., a priestess of Sin (Thureau-Dangin, *Comptes Rendus*, Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres, 1899, p. 348, pl. 1). This has been taken by Radau (*Early Babylonian History*, p. 173) as also containing the name Jau, and so as having some such meaning as 'May Jau make.' This also has been accepted by Dr. C. F. Burney in a most suggestive paper ('A Theory of the Development of Israelite Religion in Early Times,' *Journal of Theological Studies*, April 1908, p. 342). The reading is most doubtful, and should not be cited as an occurrence of Jau. I am disposed to think that the god here meant is Ea.

<sup>3</sup> The letter is published by Hrozný in Sellin, *Tell Ta'anek*, p. 116, Wien, 1904. See further a very cautious allusion to the name in Sellin, *Die alttestamentliche Religion im Rahmen der andern altorientalischen*, p. 61. Leipzig, 1908. In this little book it seems to me that Sellin might

and this name seems to be the equivalent of the Old Testament name Ahijah (1 K 14<sup>4</sup>) ("Jehovah is brother or relative"), which is thus borne by a non-Israelite. But the name Jahweh appears also as a part of the name of a king of Hamath, the north Syrian commonwealth, in the eighth century B.C. This king, who was conquered by Sargon II., king of Assyria (722-705 B.C.), bears the name *Ja-u-bi-di*, and his name is also written *I-lu-bi-di*.<sup>4</sup> Here there is an interchange between *Ilu* and *Jau* exactly as in Hebrew the name Elnathan interchanges with Jonathan.

'There can therefore be no escape from the conclusion that the divine name Jahweh is not a peculiar possession of the Hebrews. It covers a large extent of territory both geographically and ethnologically,<sup>5</sup> and the rapid accumulation of cases in which it appears during so few years makes reasonably probable a still wider use of the name than has yet been actually proved.<sup>6</sup>

'How came this name into the hands of the Hebrews? That is a question most fascinating and interesting, but it is impossible to answer it with certainty. The Jahvist uses the name Jahweh from the beginning, and regards it as known and revered by the saints and heroes far beyond the days of Moses, but the Elohist (Ex 3<sup>13ff.</sup>) and

have safely spoken more positively of the occurrence of Jahweh in Babylonian; for example, in the following sentences the caution is surely excessive: 'Ist der Name Jahwe ein spezifisches israelitisches Eigenthum? Diese Behauptung lässt sich kaum noch mit Sicherheit aufrecht halten. Zwar das Vorkommen des Namens auf kananäischen Keilschrifttafeln sowohl aus Babylon (um 2000) wie aus Palästina (Ta'anak um 1450) ist sehr unsicher' (p. 61).

<sup>4</sup> Inscriptions of Sargon, Stele i. 53; Annals, 23; Triumphal Inscription, 33; Nimrod Inscription, 8. The passages may readily be found in Winckler, *Die Keilschrifttexte Sargons*. Leipzig, 1889.

<sup>5</sup> I cannot regard as successful the attempt of Dr. C. J. Ball to find the word *Jau* in the Gilgamesh epic as a divine name or title, 'a god-man.' (See the exposition of this explanation by C. F. Burney in the article cited, *Journal of Theological Studies*, April 1908, pp. 341, 342). The expression in question is *ia-u amelu* (Tablet X, col. iv. 17), applied to Gilgames. The translation of *ia-u* proposed by Jensen, namely, 'woeful,' is still the most probable. Elsewhere Gilgames is described as showing plainly the effects of his great efforts and struggles.

<sup>6</sup> For summaries of the evidence and appraisal of the value of the individual occurrences, see A. H. Sayce, 'The Name of Yeho, Yahveh,' *THE EXPOSITORY TIMES*, vol. xviii. No. 1, Oct. 1906, pp. 26 ff.; and A. H. Sayce, 'The Name יהוה,' *THE EXPOSITORY TIMES*, vol. xix. No. 11, Aug. 1908, pp. 525, 526.

the Priest Codex (Ex 6<sup>2ff.</sup>) assume that it was revealed first to Moses, and by him to the people. This, of course, does not mean that the God Himself was unknown to the ancestors of Moses; indeed, the very earliest sources see in Jahweh the God of the ancestors of Israel. But Moses is the founder, the real founder of Israel's religion, and with him begins the building up of that great series of thoughts about this God which have given all human thinking a new channel.<sup>1</sup> There are good reasons for believing that among the Kenites Jahweh was a God of high rank, and among them Moses had residence, and all that they had to witness of this God must have passed before him; but it was no mere local god that Moses introduced in power to Israel. From the very beginning He is a God able to put others beneath His feet.<sup>2</sup>

At first sight this may seem like a startling robbery of Israel, this taking away from her the divine name Jahweh as an exclusive possession. But it is not so. Jahweh himself is not taken away. He remains the priceless possession, the chief glory of Israel. It is only the *name* that is shown to be widespread. And the *name* matters little. The great question is, what does the name

convey?—what is its theological content?<sup>3</sup> The *name* came to Israel from the outside. But into that vessel a long line of prophets, from Moses onward, poured such a flood of attributes as never a priest in all Western Asia, from Babylonia to the Sea, ever dreamed of in his highest moments of spiritual insight. In this name, and through Israel's history, God chose to reveal Himself to Israel, and by Israel to the world. Therein lies the supreme and lonesome superiority of Israel over Babylonia.<sup>4</sup>

### The Books of the Month.

*The Baptist Handbook* for 1909 may be had at the Baptist Union Publication Department in London, or from any bookseller (2s. 6d. net). The editor is the Rev. W. J. Avery, who certainly knows his business. Even the stranger and the wayfaring man need not err in making his way through this book.

Happy are the members of the Early English or of the Scottish Text Societies, who possess their critical edition of Barbour's *Bruce*. Happy also those who, though not members, can buy a complete set of these publications, or even a single volume, at the mighty price they fetch in the market. Happy now, however, any person who can afford 5s.; for at that price Messrs. A. & C. Black have published *The Bruce*, edited from the best texts, with literary and historical introduction, notes and appendixes, and a glossary, by Mr. W. M. Mackenzie, M.A., F.S.A.

If Professor Rudolf Eucken of Jena is not known in this country it will not be the fault of Mr. W. R. Boyce Gibson. Mr. Gibson has followed up his book on Eucken's 'Philosophy of Life' with a study in Eucken's religious idealism, to which he gives the title of *God with us* (A. & C. Black; 3s. 6d. net). It is simply a fuller exposition of Eucken's philosophy, not so systematic as the former book, and more familiar. At the same time the philosophy of Eucken has gone through the mind of Mr. Boyce Gibson, and his mind has turned it into English thought and into English language. There is one surprise

<sup>1</sup> On the name Jahweh see further the very able article by Driver, which is by no means superseded, in *Studia Biblica*, i. (1885); and the same author's *Book of Genesis* (London, 1904), pp. 407, 409; Kautzsch, *Encyclopædia Biblica*, art. 'Names,' §§ 109–113, and the same writer in *Hastings' Bible Dictionary*, Extra Volume, pp. 265 ff.

<sup>2</sup> The whole question of Israel's witness to Jahweh in the earliest time is ably handled by Marti in a paper of great suggestiveness ('Jahwe und seine Auffassung in der ältesten Zeit,' *Theologische Studien und Kritiken*, 1908, pp. 322–333), with most of which I find myself in complete agreement. I must hear quote a paragraph in which I am happy to find a strong support for some things which I have earnestly defended above. After asking how it happens that Jahweh becomes to the Hebrews a quite different God from that which He had been to other peoples, Marti proceeds thus: 'Ich denke dabei an die Tätigkeit und den Einfluss einer prophetischen Gestalt (etwa Mose). Jedenfalls aber möchte ich es durchaus ablehnen, dass dazu irgendwie der imaginäre altorientalische Monotheismus mitgewirkt habe. Soweit ich sehen kann, finde ich diesen Monotheismus des alten Orients nur in der Phantasie einiger moderner Gelehrten, aber nirgends in den Kulterzentren und Priesterkreisen des vorderen Orients. Zudem hat es die babylonisch-assyrische Religion ihr Leben lang nie zu einem wirklichen Monotheismus, der diesen Namen verdiente, gebracht und ist auch der Gott Israels am Anfang, so sehr er eine der Dämonen und andere göttliche Mächte überragende Bedeutung besass, noch lange nicht der *eine* Gott gewesen' (*Op. cit.* p. 333).

<sup>3</sup> See the sane and convincing remarks of Driver, *The Book of Genesis*, p. 409. London, 1904.



—that the book contains no index. A book of philosophy without an index is shorn of half its value.

---

Other two volumes have been issued of the Cambridge edition of the Revised Version for schools—*Galatians and Romans*, by the Rev. H. W. Fulford, M.A.; and the *Epistles to the Corinthians*, by the Rev. S. C. Carpenter, M.A. (1s. 6d. net each).

---

The Caxton Publishing Company has published the first volume of *The Pulpit Encyclopædia*. The editor is the Rev. F. T. Simmonds. In outward appearance the volume reminds us somewhat of Messrs. Funk & Wagnall's publications, a resemblance which is increased by the portraits which are found throughout it. They are the portraits of men whose faces are familiar in all the world—Spurgeon, Clifford, Maclaren, Parker, and others. We should have preferred to see some faces that are less familiar to us, but these popular publishers know what they are doing better than we can tell them.

The idea of the Encyclopædia is to reprint a great number of sermons in a condensed form and to arrange them according to their subject. This first volume contains theological sermons only, and it is to be followed by another of the same kind. Not only are they all theological, but they are also arranged here in the order of a theological treatise, beginning with Apologetics and passing on to the Basis of Faith and the Doctrine of God. First of all, however, there is a series of sermons on Christian Unity, to be taken apparently as an introduction to the whole work, in which authors of all branches of the Church will be found together. The whole is introduced by a sketch of the history of preaching, written by Professor E. C. Dargan of the Baptist Theological Seminary, Kentucky.

Well, there are hungry shepherds as well as hungry sheep. This is for them.

---

The Christian Endeavour Union of Great Britain and Ireland is publishing a series of booklets as aids to Bible study. Among them we notice, *How best to read the New Testament*, by Professor G. Currie Martin; and *Paul's Letters, their Order and Purpose*, by Principal J. S. Clemens (3d. each).

The new volume of the Oxford translation of Aristotle is the *Metaphysica* (Clarendon Press; 7s. 6d. net). It is the eighth volume of the complete works. The translator is Mr. W. D. Ross, M.A., Fellow of Oriel College, one of the general editors.

It is a translation which will not encourage the study of Greek. For it is so accurate and yet so idiomatically English that the student of philosophy cannot be reproached for adhering to it and leaving Aristotle's own language alone. We had marked some passages for special commendation; but it is needless to quote them, and it would be invidious. Manifestly Mr. Ross has profited to the fullest extent by the studies of all his predecessors, and has made this particular work of Aristotle his own peculiar possession. There are places which still admit of more meanings than one, and if Mr. Ross is doubtful it is the fulness of his study that makes him doubtful. But such places are not numerous now, and it may be good that something is left for the beginner in the translation of Aristotle to break his milk-teeth upon.

---

To Messrs. Constable's 'Religions, Ancient and Modern' has been added a volume on *Early Christianity* (1s. net), by Mr. S. B. Slack, M.A. And to their 'Philosophies, Ancient and Modern,' Mr. W. H. Hudson has added *Herbert Spencer* (1s. net).

---

Professor Joseph Agar Beet has written an account of the authorship, date, and worth of the books of the New Testament. It is very simple and reliable, and it will be very useful. The title is simply *The New Testament* (Culley; 1s. 6d. net).

Mr. Culley has also re-issued Dr. Agar Beet's Fernley Lecture, *The Credentials of the Gospel* (2s. 6d. net). This is the seventh thousand, which is a good circulation for a volume of Apologetics of any kind in these days.

---

Messrs. Funk & Wagnalls have published the second volume of *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*. It contains the articles dealing with the Bible. These, of course, are to a large extent unnecessary to those who possess one of the newer Dictionaries of the Bible. To those who do not they are a mine of information (information of the most accurate kind

whenever Professor Nestle is the author). And even to those who do they are not altogether superfluous, since they are condensed from larger articles or written on a moderate scale. The bibliographies are occasionally puzzling. Matthew Arnold's 'Literature and Dogma' is represented as published in New York, latest edition 1902. Carpenter's 'Bible in the Nineteenth Century' is said to be 'scholarly and reverent, but on scientific basis.' Dr. Dods is described in the words, 'well-known as a conservative critic.'

The volume is largely occupied with the letter B, and consequently with biography. A large number of the biographies are unsigned; they are probably written by one or other of the editors. The editors are numerous. The editor in chief is Dr. S. M. Jackson of New York. The associate editors are Mr. C. C. Sherman and Professor G. W. Gilmore. Besides these, there are in this volume no fewer than eight departmental editors. It is a miracle that with so many cooks the broth has not been spoilt. But they seem to have all had work to do, and they seem to have all done it well. It probably costs more both in work and in worry to condense other men's articles than to write articles of one's own.

This volume contains not only many biographies, but many biographies of living men. This feature of the work—the inclusion of living theologians—may make the book look old before its time, but for the moment it is extremely useful.

Surely the very climax on earth of the modern imitation of Christ was reached by the late Bishop Wilkinson of St. Andrews, and is expounded in *Some Laws in God's Spiritual Kingdom* (Wells Gardner; 5s. net). It is the book of a thinker, and it is arranged in order, as the things of the Spirit should always be. But its value lies not in the individual thoughts it offers us, or in the systematic arrangement of its theology, so much as in the atmosphere we breathe while we read the book. It is an atmosphere that hushes our strife, that brings us into the awe and majesty of the Cherubim and the Mercy-Seat. Yet there is no suggestion of a *school* of doctrine, whether Keswick or any other. Nor is the theology to be described as peculiar, as traditional, as modern, or by any other limiting adjective. Great was the effort of this man during his life to unite the branches of Christ's Church in Scotland. It is not im-

probable that he has accomplished his purpose by dying.

The last book of Mr. George St. Clair has had to be edited by his son. For he died on June 13th, 1908, while correcting the proofs of it. It is a study of the Biblical doctrine of man, his origin and his destiny, its title being *Man: First and Last, Cave-dweller and Christian* (Griffiths; 9s. net). It is a study conducted on good orthodox lines. The commentator on Genesis in whom Mr. St. Clair believed most heartily was Dr. Marcus Dods. And he could not have placed his faith more wisely. The book is not entirely confined to the Bible, however. Mr. St. Clair knew something of geology or at least of the geologists, admiring and profiting by the writings of Professor Boyd Dawkins and Sir Charles Lyell. It is an optimistic, encouraging book. Mr. St. Clair was not ashamed of man's past or afraid of his future. But he desired that man who came from God should find God again in Christ.

For the study of the social problem there is no book which we have seen that is more popularly useful and impressive than *Wealth and Want*, by Mr. W. B. Northrop (Griffiths; 5s. net). It is described on its title-page as 'A Study in Living Contrasts and Social Problems.' And one has nothing more to do in order to understand the difference between wealth and want, and remember it for ever, than just to look at the contrasts that are presented on every illustrated page. For each page has two pictures, one of the life of the poor, the other of the life of the rich. Here is a page, one half of which shows us a woman sinking on the pavement in the exhaustion of want, with the hand of death claiming her; the other half shows a rich man's table well supplied with wines, the company listening in carefully concealed impatience to the platitudes of some foolish hereditary lord. All very sensational? So are the facts on the opposite page of printing, and they are manufactured neither by writer nor by artist. Here, again, are two women picking oakum in a workhouse; beside them an orchid that cost £1207, 10s.

Mr. Griffiths has also published *English Church Architecture, from the Earliest Times to the Reformation*, by Mr. G. A. T. Middleton, A.R.I.B.A. (2s. 6d. net), a well-written and well-illustrated book.



That so many of the publishers are issuing books on religion is a sign that religion, which is a deeper and more primitive thing than theology, is the great study of the day. Messrs. Harper have just published a volume by Professor Flinders Petrie on *Personal Religion in Egypt before Christianity* (2s. 6d. net). Observe the double limitation—'personal,' not ecclesiastical or State religion, and 'before Christianity,' more nearly defined in the preface as 'from 500 to 200 B.C.' That is the date of the Hermetic writings. And to the Hermetic writings, as published in the 'Corpus Hermeticum,' Professor Petrie gives his almost undivided attention. Of all these writings, cosmological, theological, mystical, the god Hermes is the centre and inspiration, whence their name. But Professor Petrie proceeds with great deliberation, laying a foundation in 'Our View of the Mind,' which occupies his first chapter, and the 'Nature of the Religious Mind,' which fills the second. And in the final chapter he most conveniently provides a summary of the whole book. The religion of Egypt is an evolution. At 500 B.C. we find the belief in a supreme God, many subordinate gods, guardian angels and men. Indian influence appears in the doctrine of metempsychosis and the sacrifice of spices. But there is no mention yet of daimons, of logoi, or of conversion.

It is difficult to fix the features of the Arabs, ancient or modern, in the Bible or out of it. They are here to-day and away to-morrow. Are they treacherous or trustworthy? Are they religious or superstitious? Are they to be counted amongst the Israelites' enemies, or are they themselves Israelites? There is a great article on the religion of the ancient Arabs in the first volume of the *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics* written by Professor Nöldeke. Along with that article read Doughty's *Arabia Deserta*. Or if you cannot attain to Doughty, read a small book called *The Witness of the Wilderness*, which has been written by the Rev. G. Robinson Lees, B.A., F.R.G.S. (Longmans; 3s. 6d. net). It is a popular but reliable account of the Bedawin of the desert, their origin, history, home life, strife, religion, and superstitions, in their relation to the Bible.

Canon Bigg of Oxford had a great reputation as a preacher, but he never was himself satisfied with what he preached, and his friends could never

persuade him to publish his sermons. They have done that for him now, and the volume is worthy of his reputation.

It was a reputation for originality. The originality sometimes bordered on the eccentric. There certainly never were sermons quite like these, either preached or published before. Sometimes the author gives out a text, and then, like the Apostles, goes everywhere preaching the Word. But you are constrained to go with him wherever he goes, sometimes much attracted, sometimes dissenting fiercely.

He preaches on 'the fruit of the Spirit' (Gal 5<sup>22</sup>). The first fruit is love. 'It is better called Charity,' he says, 'for it excludes those fierce, blind, sensual passions, which we commonly include under the name of Love'—just as if it had been in ignorance or wilfulness that the Revisers changed 'charity' into 'love' in the New Testament. And he does not repent. There is another sermon on 'Charity never faileth' (1 Co 13<sup>8</sup>). There he says 'Love is too passionate, too suggestive of extravagance, of jealousies, rivalries, and egotism. It was Love—may we not say?—Love with too strong an alloy of earth—that led James and John to claim the places nearest to our Lord in His kingdom, that drew down upon Mary Magdalene the tender rebuke, "Touch me not." The same kind of Love, again, has prompted certain kinds of adoration of our Lord's humanity, and of His blessed Mother, certain hymns also which are open to objection, which are too sensuous, and at bottom irreverent.'

The Dean of Christ Church has selected the sermons, and edited the volume, of which the title is *The Spirit of Christ in Common Life* (Longmans; 6s. net).

There is no clearer evidence that a man has come to Christ than this, that he ceases to concern himself about immortality. For they who know Christ know that He brought immortality to light, and that there is no darkness round the fact of it any more. They know, not only that there is no darkness round the fact of it, but also that there is none round the state of it, that need give them trouble. And so to them spirit-rapping and everything of the kind is simply the outcome of unbelief and the evidence of its credulity.

Nevertheless there are many things to be said about *Immortality*, and the volume under that

title which has been added to the Oxford Library of Practical Theology (Longmans; 5s.) is very welcome. First of all there is the unbeliever to acquaint with the facts. And Canon Holmes is not ashamed to ply him with arguments old and new. But, more than that, the believer's thoughts have to be set in order, that the hope of immortality (notice that the word 'hope' is used in the Biblical sense of assurance) may move him to be steadfast, unmovable, and to abound in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as he knows that his labour shall not be in vain in the Lord. There are some chapters that are quite new in a volume on Immortality—the chapter on the sin of sadness, the chapter on the sin of suicide, and especially the chapter on immortality and common sense. It is a curious coincidence, after the review of Baron von Hügel's book which appeared in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES two months ago, that there should be a chapter on the pain of Paradise. \_\_\_\_\_

The latest new series, we think, is Messrs. Longmans' 'Anglican Church Handbooks.' The general editor is the Rev. W. H. Griffith Thomas, D.D., Principal of Wycliffe Hall, Oxford. Four volumes have been published—*Christianity and the Supernatural*, by Charles F. D'Arcy, D.D., Bishop of Ossory; *Social Work*, by W. Edward Chadwick, D.D., B.Sc.; *Pastoral Work*, by the Rev. R. C. Joynt, M.A.; and *The Joy of Bible Study*, by the Rev. Harrington C. Lees, M.A., Vicar of Christ Church, Beckenham (1s. net each). We hope to have something to say, especially about Mr. Lee's book, afterwards. It is enough at present to record the titles. \_\_\_\_\_

When Professor George Cadwalader Foley, D.D., of Philadelphia, was chosen to deliver the Bohlen Lectures of 1908, he decided to lecture on Anselm's *Theory of the Atonement*, and wrote a large book upon it, making his Lectures consist of selections from the book. The book is now published in this country by Messrs. Longmans (5s. net).

Why did Professor Foley of the Protestant Episcopal Church choose a subject apparently so limited as Anselm's Theory? Because Anselm's theory is the theory of the Atonement held by the Reformers. And Professor Foley does not believe in the Reformers' theory of the Atonement, nor perhaps just very much in the Reformers them-

selves. It looks very much as if his purpose, first and last, were to discredit the Reformation. But we do not think he has gone wisely about it. Certainly this is a complete and not unfair exposition and criticism of Anselm's theory, but, as he himself shows, especially in an elaborate appendix of quotations, all the modern theologians without exception, have deserted Anselm here. And the whole book has very much the look of threshing empty straw.

Professor Foley's knowledge of the literature is nearly complete; and this value, at least, his book has, it gives a good full biography of the doctrine of the Atonement. It is accurate too. We have observed 'only one slip—Dr. P. T. Forsyth's *Religion in Recent Art* is called *Religion and Recent Art*, and is credited to another author, with the initials P. J. \_\_\_\_\_

*The English Catalogue of Books for 1908* is now ready (Sampson Low; 6s. net). We possess the whole set of the English Catalogue, and use it constantly; there is nothing else worth using. The new method of publishing each year's volume separately is an enormous advantage over the old method of keeping back the publication till five or six years' books had accumulated. The mistakes are very few, though we notice one occasionally. The one that occurs most frequently (at least in the monthly numbers of the Publishers' Circular) is the repetition of the same book and not always exactly in the same form.

Who have been the prolific authors of the year? We notice with much interest that a man who is otherwise so well occupied as Professor A. S. Peake of Manchester is credited with five separate entries. \_\_\_\_\_

Is there any man living who has more joy in writing on popular Ethics than Lord Avebury? Is there any popular writer who gives more joy to his readers? There are superior philosophical persons who think it altogether beneath them to write on Aspiration, Contentment, Adversity, Kindness, or the like, which everybody loves to read about and is much the better of the reading. Lord Avebury is none of these. The truth is we have not yet half enough of that ethical education which is not independent of religion or opposed to it, but which is pressed upon us as the fruit of



living faith, as that work without which, in fact, our faith is dead. That is the task Lord Avebury takes up. And he is surely as learned as any philosopher; for you never in all your life saw such a list of degrees and honours as he has printed after his name on the title-page of *Peace and Happiness* (Macmillan; 6s. net).

If History is the reading which a man is sure to return to in the end of his days, he should prepare himself for the proper enjoyment of it by reading now some scientific history of History like Professor Bury's new book on *The Ancient Greek Historians* (Macmillan; 7s. 6d. net). It is a volume of Harvard Lectures, and it has all the charm of the lecture as a born lecturer like Professor Bury can handle it. To read the lecture on Herodotus, for example, is to return to our first great literary fascination, when this earliest and most artistic of historians laid his hand upon us, and, as Dionysius said so long ago, we admired what he wrote to the last syllable, and always wanted more. That Herodotus was a conscious artist, under the spell of the Homeric manner, is the key which Professor Bury uses to enter into his secret. His history is an epic in prose, as the *Odyssey* is an epic in poetry. On certain vexed questions Professor Bury has his own mind. The speeches of Thucydides are not free invention. Thucydidean as they are in style, he probably heard those delivered at Athens, he was informed of the heads of those delivered at Sparta, and he has simply reproduced the drift of them all.

Mrs. F. S. Boas writes easily, and popularly. Her latest book is *Heroes of the Hebrew Monarchy* (Horace Marshall; 1s. 6d.).

Mr. Wilfred T. Grenfell, M.D., C.M.G., in *A Man's Faith* (Marshall Brothers; 1s. net), has set down a plain statement of his own faith, and it is the only way of faith for you and me.

There are many collections of sermons published on the seven words from the cross. But there is room for *The Great Oblation* (Masters; 1s. 6d. net), by the Rev. Francis Logie Hutchieson, M.A. It is devotional and thoughtful.

How do we stand, after all our recent contro-

versies, towards the great doctrines of the faith—the doctrine of God, the Fall, the Atonement, the Resurrection, Everlasting Punishment, Inspiration, Miracles? That is the question which the Rev. Percy Ansley Ellis, Vicar of St. Mary's, Westminster, answers in *Old Beliefs and Modern Believers* (Melrose; 3s. 6d. net). The modification which these controversies have made is enormous. For example, 'There is nothing in the Bible,' says Mr. Ellis, 'to suggest that man began at the top and was degraded by sin. That has come from Milton. The most that can be gathered from the Bible is that man was made for progress, and that progress has been retarded by sin.' But modification is not abolition. All the great doctrines stand; and they stand to this generation as firmly as they did to our fathers.

If a volume of *Selected Essays of Thomas Carlyle* (Melrose; 2s. 6d. net) sells, it is the Introduction that will sell it. For the essays we have already, those of us who care for Carlyle; but the Introduction is new, and it is written by Professor A. Seth Pringle-Pattison, LL.D. It is really an essay on Carlyle himself, although a trifle short for our appetite. Carlyle's own essays in the book are Biography, Boswell's Johnson, Burns, and Sir Walter Scott.

The Rev. Wilfrid Richmond has gone through St. Paul's early Epistles and gathered out the texts that bear upon any of the clauses of the Creed. He has set down the clause of the Creed in his margin for comparison. And he has succeeded in making each chapter an exposition of the theology of the particular epistle. The title is *The Creed in the Epistles* (Methuen; 2s. 6d. net).

Messrs. Mowbray of Oxford Circus are the publishers in this country of *The Living Church Annual* (50 cents), which is the Year-Book of the Episcopal Church in America. It contains portraits of some bishops to make it popular; but it is really a work of Science, so intelligently is its mass of information set forth.

*The Confessions of Al Ghazzali* is the new volume of the 'Wisdom of the East' series. The translation has been done by the very capable hand of Mr. Claud Field (Murray; 1s. net).

A surpassingly clear and comprehensive introduction to the study of Ethics is provided in *A*

*Primer of Ethics*, by Miss E. E. Constance Jones, of Girton College, Cambridge (Murray; 1s.). The ethical vocabulary at the end is well selected, and will be useful.

In good time for the quater-centenary, the Rev. C. H. Irwin has published a popular biography of Calvin. The title is *John Calvin, the Man and his Work* (R.T.S.; 2s. 6d.). It is popular, but it has not been written too easily. Mr. Irwin has verified his references. And if Calvin is his hero, he shows that Calvin is heroic.

The R.T.S. has been to press with yet another impression of Edersheim's *The Temple* (2s.). It is a triumph of beautiful binding.

The latest 'Oxford Church Text-Book' is *A Short Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, by the Rev. G. H. Box, M.A. (Rivingtons; 1s. net). It contains an amazing amount of matter; for there has been a merciless use made of small type, and the book runs to about 150 pages. And what is more wonderful at the money, every line of it has cost the author time to investigate and time to set it down succinctly. For Mr. Box is one of our most conscientious scholars.

Mr. W. S. Walford, M.A., has published a translation of *The Apology of Aristides* (Walter Scott; 1s. net), with valuable short introductions and two appendixes, one on the Syriac Version, the other a translation of the Armenian Fragment.

*The Melody of the Heart* is a small, exceedingly attractive volume of selections of great thoughts. It is not always good for authors to pick out their plums from the rest of the pudding, and it is not always good for us. But as we walk through the wilderness of this world we need some encouragement to hold our head up. And here we have the company of great men who are every moment reminding us what to say and do that we too may make our lives sublime. The book is published by Messrs. Simpkin at 1s. net in cloth.

Who will admit ignorance of the Tractarian Movement in Oxford? Who will claim knowledge of the Noetic Movement? We have had the Tractarians described till we know the colour of their eyebrows. Some of the Noetics we scarcely

know by name; and those of them we do know, we know not as Noetics but as something else. Well, here are their names at last—Eveleigh, Copleston, Whately, Arnold, Hampden, Hawkins, Baden Powell, and Blanco White. And here is a satisfactory, even a most discriminating and delightful, account of them written by the Rev. W. Tuckwell, M.A., the author of *Reminiscences of Oxford*, and just the man of all men to tell the story of the Noetics and make them live at last, and live for ever. By his title *Pre-Tractarian Oxford* (Smith, Elder, & Co.; 7s. 6d. net), Mr. Tuckwell has cleverly attached Noetism, of which we are ignorant, and about which we are indifferent, to Tractarianism, which we do know something of, and always believed we were much interested in. He loves the men; they are heroes to him; and he makes us love them also. And then he tells good stories about them, making his book a delight from cover to cover.

Messrs. Smith, Elder, & Co. have done a most graceful deed in issuing Sir Leslie Stephen's *Hours in a Library*, the three volumes beautifully printed and handsomely bound, at a price within everybody's reach (3s. 6d. net each). The old expensive edition has been the unattainable desire of many a student of English Literature. This edition is attainable. And it is better than the old, for the contents have been revised and re-arranged. This is the work by which Leslie Stephen will be known when all the rest of his books have been forgotten. It is more delicately literary, and it is more characteristic of its author than even the *History of English Thought in the Eighteenth Century*.

The thirty-fourth Bulletin of the Bureau of American Ethnology contains *Physiological and Medical Observations among the Indians of South-Western United States and Northern Mexico* (Washington: At the Smithsonian Institution). The author is Mr. Aleš Hrdlicka. There is no uncivilized race in the world that is contributing so much to the progress of science as the American Indian. And this is due to the far-seeing and untiring efforts of the Bureau of American Ethnology as directed by its chief, Mr. W. H. Holmes. The amount of scientific information gathered into this volume is amazing.

Canon Sir John C. Hawkins, Bart., has repub-



lished the articles on *The Use of Dante as an Illustrator of Scripture* which he contributed to THE EXPOSITORY TIMES in 1905. He has made a few additions; he has brought down the list of books to 1908; and now the little book is without question the easiest and best introduction to the Biblical study of Dante in English (S.P.C.K.).

Mr. Charles L. Marson has issued a fourth edition of his *Psalms at Work* (Elliot Stock; 6s. net). In doing so, he says: 'In presenting a fourth edition of *The Psalms at Work*, like the former editions somewhat enlarged, the collector must own to some delay. Another author has stepped into the breach, and by a daring piece of free trade, has incorporated almost the whole of the second edition into a work of his own and cried it freely before the public. He was not aware of the third edition, or he could have enjoyed more freely still his powers of digestion and assimilation.'

Is the opinion that our Lord is already come for the second time gaining in favour? There are some signs that it is. One of them is a substantial volume written by Mr. Thomas Nayler, to prove that the Second Coming took place at the end of the siege of Jerusalem in the year 70 A.D. Its title is *Light on the Advent*. It is published by Mr. Elliot Stock (5s. net).

*Consider the Butterflies how they grow* (Elliot Stock; 3s. 6d. net) is a pleasantly written and prettily illustrated book by Lucas P. Stubbs, and the butterfly is made good use of to lead to religion and morality.

*Light for Lesser Days* is the title of a volume of 'Studies of the Saints.' It is written by the Rev. Horace Finn Tucker, Canon of St. Paul's Cathedral, and Vicar of Christ Church, Melbourne. It consists of readings, meditations, devotions, and illustrations for the minor festivals commemorated in the English Kalendar (Elliot Stock; 6s. net).

Mr. Elliot Stock has also published (1) *Miracle and Infidelity*, by Samuel Knaggs, M.R.C.S. (1s. 6d. net); (2) *Thoughts on Bible Teaching*, by Constance Nankivell (1s. net); and (3) *Resurrection Life*, by the Rev. Nathaniel Jones, M.A. (1s. net).

One of the most useful books on Palestine, especially for the preacher's purpose, that has ever been written is the Rev. James Kean's *Among the Holy Places*. We have been accustomed to put it next to Thomson's *Land and the Book*. Its popularity is therefore no surprise to us. Mr. Fisher Unwin, after issuing a sixth impression of the first edition as late as November last, has now published a second edition (5s.). At least we understand that this is a second edition. We cannot lay our hands on our copy of the first edition, but we think that the attractive outline drawings at least are new, although we think we have seen the photographs before.

The translation of Professor Bousset's 'What is Religion?' has been followed by a translation of *The Faith of a Modern Protestant* (Fisher Unwin; 2s. 6d. net). The translator is the same, Miss F. B. Low, and the translation is very well done. What are we to say about the Faith of a Modern Protestant? It lacks just one thing, but, alas, it is a very great thing. Jesus is the highest we have known on earth, but He came and went as other men. Professor Bousset rises gradually in his exposition of his faith till he reaches the forgiveness of sins. But the forgiveness of sins is not bound up with the redemption that is in Christ. The most that Jesus did was to make us certain and secure of a God who forgives sins.

Messrs. Washbourne have published the third volume of the Rev. D. Chisholm's *The Catechism in Examples*. Its contents are 'Charity' and 'The Commandments.'

*The Vulgate, the Source of False Doctrines*, by Professor George Henslow (Williams & Norgate; 2s. 6d. net), is really a good strong Protestant polemic. Its chapters deal with doctrines—oblation, propitiation, repentance, purgatory, absolution. And under each doctrinal heading there is very plain statement of the false teaching of the Roman Church, and the reason of it, the reason of it being that that Church has followed the Vulgate instead of going to the original Hebrew or Greek. A simple example is Repentance—Vulgate *pœnitentia*, whence penance, and all the agony of hair shirts.

# The Archaeology of the Book of Genesis.

By PROFESSOR A. H. SAYCE, D.D., LL.D., D.LITT., OXFORD.

## II.

15. 'Jahweh God took the man.'—Similarly, in the Babylonian story of the Deluge, Utu-napistim states that 'Bel took my hand and led me' to the Paradise 'at the mouth of the rivers' of Edin, where he and his wife were 'made like the gods' (*Epic of Gilgames*, xi. 198-205). The conception of the deity or his representative, the priest, taking the man by his hand and leading him to the image and dwelling-place of the god was peculiarly Babylonian, and we find many representations of it on the early seal-cylinders. The ceremony of 'taking the hand of Bel,' *i.e.* Merodach, and thereby becoming his adopted son, which was needed to legitimize the title of a Babylonian king, is connected with the same idea. Since 'Yahweh-Elohim took the man and led him into the garden,' the creation of Adam would have been in Eden, outside the garden (see v.<sup>8</sup> and 3<sup>23</sup>).

Babylonia was an agricultural country before it became a commercial one, and to the last agriculture formed the basis of the State. But 'the man' was delivered from the hard work of ordinary agriculture by being conducted to the garden or plantation of the deity, where the lighter work of tending the sacred trees and shrubs was assigned to him. As the garden was that of the deity, and the produce of what was grown in it was used in the divine worship, 'the man' was thus engaged in the service of his god, the very reason, in fact, on account of which, according to the Sixth Tablet of the *Epic of the Creation*, mankind was created. Adam's services were thus owed to Yahweh-Elohim alone; he could not obey the instructions of any other god without breaking the contract into which, in the eyes of the Babylonian, he would have entered, and forfeiting all his rights as the servant of Yahweh. Hence he was required not only to 'cultivate' it, but also to 'watch' and protect it from hostile attack. In the legend which gathered round the early life of Sargon of Akkad, the great king is similarly said to have become the gardener of Istar, and 'in his gardenership' to have been loved by the goddess.

The 'garden' here also was strictly a plantation. It was in a similar plantation (of cedar trees), according to Assur-bani-pal,<sup>1</sup> that Susinak, 'the god of Susa,' had his secret dwelling (*mûsab*) and 'oracle' (*pirîšti*) with its hidden knowledge of good and evil.

16. The Babylonian original of the latter part of the verse was probably *inib kal etsi ina gani akala takul*.

17. **The Food of Death.**—The threatened death 'on the day' on which the fruit of the tree of knowledge was eaten did not take place (see note on 3<sup>4</sup>). A parallel is to be found in the Babylonian myth of Adamu, who was told by his god Ea that he would be offered 'the food of death' (*akala sa muti*) and 'the waters of death' (*mê muti*), which he was accordingly to refuse, but who was actually offered 'the food of life' (*akal baladhi*) and 'the waters of life' (*mê baladhi*), which he refused in accordance with his lord's command, and so lost the gift of immortality.

The belief in a 'food of death' and a 'food of life' was Babylonian. In the Penitential Psalms the penitent is made to say, 'the cursed thing of my god unknowingly did I eat' (see my Hibbert Lectures on Babylonian Religion, p. 350). But why the fruit of the oracle tree should have been forbidden does not appear at first sight, unless upon the supposition that as a gardener and servant 'the man' was not allowed to obtain the knowledge which only the priest as the representative of the deity was permitted to possess. Ea, the All-wise, at all events, freely communicated his knowledge of spells and incantations to his son Ašari, and through him to mankind, and this knowledge included how to heal the sick and raise the dead to life. On the other hand, the tablets of destiny were the property of Ellil of Nippur, and no one else was allowed to become possessed of them. They had been the spoil of victory torn from the breast of the demon husband of the dragon Tiamât, the possession of which 'secured the sovereignty of the world to the gods of light,

<sup>1</sup> See *W.A.I.* v. col. v. 129, vi. 30.



and their theft by the god Zû made him an outlaw, pursued and condemned to death by the gods of heaven. Has there been an intentional identification of the fruit of the oracle tree of Ea with the tablets of destiny of Ellil? At the same time it must be remembered that the 'oracle' of the god of Susa in the cedar grove near that city was, according to Assur-bani-pal, tabooed to all but the priests.

18. 'A helpmeet for him' is a curious expression, *êzer* (Ass. *izru*), 'a succour,' being hardly the description of a woman that we should have expected in a Semitic writer. Can the original have had *ezirtu*, 'form,' 'image'? The Babylonian lexicographers confound the two roots *ezeru* (עֲזַר) (with its derivatives *ezirtu*, *uzurtu*, etc.) and *nazaru*, 'to defend' (with its derivatives *izru*, *uzzuru*, etc.). In the Tel el-Amarna tablets the *z* of *nazaru* becomes *z*.

19. That *ezirtu* (or *ezru*) existed in the original of v.<sup>18</sup> seems clear from this verse, which otherwise would have no connexion with what precedes. The 'creation' of Yahweh-Elohim was not the woman, but 'the beasts of the field and the fowl of the heavens,' since the passage reads: 'And Yahweh-Elohim said, It is not good that the man should be alone (Ass. *edissu*); I will make for him *ezir* [like himself]. So out of the ground Yahweh-Elohim formed every beast of the field,' etc. The creation of the woman came afterwards when no 'ezir like himself' had been discovered among the beasts and birds.

The 'ground' is that of the garden, according to v.<sup>9</sup>. Hence 'the beast of the field' means the domesticated animals of Babylonia (who were offered in sacrifice to the gods), like the Babylonian *pul tseri* or *pul Edinna* of which it is a translation.<sup>1</sup> But it included the serpent (3<sup>1</sup>), which was naturally to be found in a garden or plantation. The *pul tseri* are also called 'the cattle of the god Ner,' who would thus have been the god of 'the field.' Tiglath-pileser I. speaks of *pul tseri gimirta u itsursur samê*, 'all beasts of the field and fowl of the heavens.'

<sup>1</sup> *Pul tseri* is opposed to *umam tseri*, 'the wild beasts.'

The Heb. נֶפֶשׁ חַיָּה, *nephesh hayyâh*, 'breath of life' (Ass. *baladh napisti*) comes from v.<sup>7</sup>, and must be a gloss upon the words 'that (was) their name,' which has made its way into the text. That it should precede שְׁמוֹ הוּא is due to the fact that Hebrew is written from right to left, whereas in Assyrian, which is written from the left to right, the gloss is always in the right hand column.

20. 'All cattle' is another gloss explaining 'every beast of the field,' which in Hebrew would have included wild beasts as well as domesticated ones. As in v.<sup>19</sup>, the original order would have been 'every beast of the field and every fowl of the heavens.'

21, 22.—Mr. King compares the statement of Merodach in the Epic of the Creation, that 'My blood will I take and bone will I [fashion]; I will make man,' where the Assyrian word for 'bone' is *etstsimtum*, the Heb. *etsem* (*Seven Tablets of Creation*, i. p. 87). In the story of the Descent of Istar into Hades the verb used when it is said that Ea 'made' the androgyne Atsu-sunamir is *ibni*, like יָבַן, *yâben*, here.

As the animals had been 'made to come' by Yahweh-Elohim to 'the man,' so, when it was found that they were no *ezir* like himself, the woman was made to come to him.

23. **Woman.**—This etymological note is of West Semitic origin, since, though *assatu* is 'woman' in Babylonian, *nisu*, and not *isu*, is 'man.' In *W.A.I.* ii. 32. 24, *astu* is given as the West Semitic equivalent of *assatu*.

24. Among the Hebrews and Beduin the woman married into the family of the man, not conversely. Hence in this verse we seem to have a reflexion of early Babylonian feeling which placed the woman more on a footing of equality with the man.

25. Adamu in the Babylonian story of the first man was similarly naked until he received garments from Ea and Anu. The likeness in Hebrew between עָרֹם, *ârûm*, 'naked,' and עוֹרֹם, *ôrûm*, 'wise,' reproduces that in Babylonian between *erum*, 'naked,' *urum*, 'shame,' and *ersum*, 'wise.' In the original there would have been a play upon the words *erum* and *urum*.

## The Pilgrim's Progress.

BY THE REV. JOHN KELMAN, M.A., D.D., EDINBURGH.

### The Flatterer.

THIS is a curiously handled passage, which leaves more room than most for various interpretations. One writer takes the Flatterer to be the devil, another antinomianism, and a third self-righteousness; while the shining one has been understood sometimes as the Holy Ghost, sometimes as the Fatherhood of God, and so on. Offor's refreshing comment is that 'When ministers differ, private Christians must think for themselves,' and under the shelter of that permission we may be allowed to regard the natural interpretation of the incident as not theological at all, but psychological, and to make the Flatterer simply stand for the flatterer.

It is probable that John Bunyan personally was less troubled with this than with almost any temptation. The sort of flattery he met with seems to have been such as this, that 'It began to be rumoured up and down among the people that I was a witch, a Jesuit, a highwayman, and the like.' Yet in his *Brief Account of his Call to the Ministry*, we find a good deal of allusion to dangers of this sort in connexion with his gifts as a preacher. He gives us certain considerations which he speaks of as 'a maul on the head of pride and desire of vain-glory'; and he tells us how pride and self-conceit and such vices are 'easily blown up at the applause of every unadvised Christian, to the endangering of a poor creature to fall into the condemnation of the devil.' In his later days, when his popularity as a preacher was altogether phenomenal, we are told that 'It pleased him, but he was on the watch against the pleasure of being himself admired. A friend complimented him once after service, on "the sweet sermon" which he had delivered. "You need not remind me of that," he said. "The Devil told me of it before I was out of the pulpit."'

Flattery was a very common fashion in the high society of his time, and no doubt like other vices it spread down through the whole community. Court-life is always subject to it, especially the life of such a court as that of Charles II., where Shakespeare's earlier criticism was applicable enough, that 'they'll take suggestion as a

cat laps milk.' Partly in view of this, and partly because it is so congenial to poor human nature apart from court-life, we can understand the subtle significance of the clever sentence, 'they came at a place where they saw a way put itself into their way.' There was no stile to cross this time, and indeed the way 'seemed withal to lie as straight' as their own. It *put itself* into their way—as if it and the landscape generally were responsible for anything that might happen rather than the pilgrims. It seemed to be a heavenward path, and the first man they met on it assured them that that was whither he was going. They all say that, deceivers and blunderers and pilgrims. Everybody either thinks or pretends to think that of himself, and (so good are their apparent intentions) each man we meet seems surer of the path than the last man.

But the annoying thing is that Christian should over and over again be deceived by strangers, who appear only to have to say 'Follow me,' and he follows. But very near to the conscience and the soul of Bunyan was Luther's Commentary on Galatians. That Church had been flattered into self-righteousness, bewitched and entangled in the nets of this dark magic, and 'Luther was wont to caution against this white devil as much as the black one.' These had taught him how subtle a temptation this is. His Christian is indeed a lonely man, whose soul often dwells apart, austere and strong. Yet even such a man may be on one side of his nature extremely impressionable, and indeed the very austerity may add to the bewitching power of human society and fellowship, and may lead to hours of strange and violent reaction.

The mention of Flatterer's blackness is one of the rare colour touches in John Bunyan's writing. First of all it may be supposed to stand for badness when used by a member of any of the white races. It is a curious fact that the black races reverse this order, and whiteness is for them the colour of fear or of wickedness. It is said that an illustrated edition of the Bible was lately published, and had a great sale among the negroes in the Southern States of America, in which the angels were depicted as black and the devils white. It



is a fine instance of national self-satisfaction that this phenomenon presents. But behind this obvious explanation there is a second. The whole district through which the pilgrims are now moving is a region half-understood, with mystery and magic in it. The dark colour may well have been chosen to fit with this enchantment. There is a certain sensuous suggestion, an uncanny lusciousness, about that dusky body half visible beneath the light robe. It is a familiar kind of picture, often used to the same effect in the early romances of chivalry; and it would be difficult to find an apter physical counterpart for the effect of flattery upon spirits sensitive to its power.

1. The simplest interpretation of the Flatterer would be that which takes him for a human friend and companion. Literature is full of wise words and shameful pictures on this subject. Montaigne comes to mind, with his flatterers of Dionysius that ran against one another in his presence and stumbled to show they were as purblind as he; Bacon, with his scorn of the praises of the common people. Johnson explains the pleasantness of flatterers even when we know them to be insincere, 'for they prove at least our power, and show that our favour is valued, since it is purchased by the meanness of falsehood.' Goldsmith, in singularly brutal fashion, wrote of Garrick:

Of praise a mere glutton, he swallow'd what came,  
And the puff of a dunce, he mistook it for fame;  
Till, his relish grown callous, almost to disease,  
Who peppered the highest was surest to please.  
But let us be candid, and speak out our mind;  
If dunces applauded, he paid them in kind.

It is a humiliating record of one of the weakest things in our poor human nature. Now and then most of us need to remember our essential human independence. We know ourselves better than those who flatter us do. We know worse things, aye, and better things too, about our own souls than they can ever guess. And it is a safe plan for every man often to retire into the solitude of his own soul, and pronounce upon himself so clear and unflinching a judgment, that he will trust that and act upon it rather than the pleasantest things that others say about him.

Perhaps the strangest feature of this incident is that it is a total stranger who thus beguiles Christian. The excessive gratitude of those he had helped and guided might have found an entrance, but how could this casual person know?

Christian knew himself to be just a very ordinary pilgrim, with a very average record. Yet when this wayside acquaintance of the moment calls him a paragon, he falls at once into the snare. It is said of a well-known divine that when some such incident befell him he replied, 'I don't take tips—pass your praise up!'

Dr. Whyte, in one of his richest and most suggestive chapters, deals with this subject, and is at great pains to distinguish between praise and flattery. It is a vital distinction, for there is no more imperative duty than that of appreciation. For want of a little kindly speech, a little recognition when a man is trying honestly to do his best, lives grow discouraged, and many men sink under the sense of failure. In a world which for countless people is so discouraging and disheartening as this, it becomes a manifest part of every generous man's mission in life to appreciate and to give praise. We all know among our acquaintances some who make us feel small and incapable and useless; while there are others who have the power of drawing out our best and making us feel that we are not quite such failures after all. Such friends are among God's blessed ones, and few of all His servants have chosen a more God-like task.

The test which will enable us to distinguish between a flatterer and an encourager, between just appreciation and excessive and hurtful praise, is not one that can easily be expressed in words. It lies partly in the character of the speaker. An honest, sincere, and hearty friend, who is simply speaking the truth in love, may generally be trusted even though we know well enough that our friends often think too highly of us. On the other hand, there is an untoward race of people who are afflicted with a positive disease of smooth-speaking, people who seem to be always bidding for intimacy and affection—a craving which is rather a token of self-indulgence than of love. On the other hand the test lies partly in the hearer. There are some who can not only stand praise, but who are better for it. It braces them for fresh endeavour, and inspires them to be worthy of the good opinion with which their friends have honoured them. Others are so vain, so silly, so unused to self-examination, that praise intoxicates them. For want of independent self-examination many a pleasant character has been disfigured and destroyed, in this way, through its very virtues.

2. A subtler interpretation of the Flatterer is permissible—he may be within, and not without, the soul of the flattered one. It is significant that this flatterer is almost silent in the story, and that he does not utter a single word of praise. This reticence must have cost the author a considerable amount of self-denial. A conversation brilliant and facetious would have been so obviously welcome and so easy for Bunyan to construct. One is tempted to think that there must have been some special reason for this reticence, and to ask whether it may not have been that he was thinking of silent flattery within the soul rather than of any external voice of foolish friend or sinister and hypocritical enemy. ‘If he be a cunning flatterer,’ says Bacon, in his famous essay on Praise, ‘he will follow the arch-flatterer, which is a man’s self, and wherein a man thinketh best of himself therein the flatterer will uphold him most.’

The context of the story would seem to support this view. Christian had certainly been lacking in meekness both towards Hopeful and towards Ignorance. Even if he had in both cases been wholly in the right, which he was not, there was a note of superiority which would have stained his righteousness with *hauteur* and neutralized it with consciousness. The Pharisees of Christ’s day were not the last of that race of religious persons who ‘trusted in themselves that they were righteous and despised others.’ Sometimes good people, sailing off upon some theory of holiness or perfection, grow blind to the actual facts of sin in their own lives, until they present a spectacle at once of amazement and of scorn to sensible men who make no such profession. Such one-sided living on theory unchecked by self-examination leads them to overestimate their own advance in character, and to forget that they are professing to have advanced beyond the Lord’s Prayer and the Apostle Paul.

It has been pointed out that this incident comes late in the pilgrimage. The wiles of the Flatterer are ‘decoys for a ripe and real spirituality which is off its guard.’ That the spirituality is real there can be no question. But spirituality, like all other high things, has dangers corresponding to its height. It cannot but be aware of its own preciousness. Humility does not involve ignorance, or the denying of obvious and blessed facts of one’s own growth in grace. And here again we have to remember the difference between praise

and flattery. It is simply untrue to say that ‘self-praise is no honour.’ That were to canonize Uriah Heep. The witness of a good conscience is one of God’s great rewards, and no man ever asserted himself more boldly against unjust detractors than did Paul with his ‘I know nothing against myself,’ or John with his still stronger ‘We are of God, and the whole world lieth in wickedness.’ It would say little for the reality of Christian experience if an experienced Christian like this pilgrim did not feel the superiority of his condition to that of a poor creature like Ignorance. To feel glad when we are sure of our principles and are doing right; to say to one’s soul, and that often, that it is a great and high thing to be a Christian, exalted above the world and made free of our inheritance among them that are being sanctified—surely this is inevitable, if righteousness and victory be in any sense realities of experience. And yet such assurance demands much carefulness of spirit. That banner is almost too heavy for our hands to carry on the march without overbalancing and bringing us to earth.

The account of the disillusionment is not, perhaps, a particularly happy passage from the artistic point of view; but point by point it is true to life. They were so interested and entertained by their dusky guide with his light garment that they failed to notice the curve of the road. By imperceptible degrees it bent until the direction of their walk is the opposite of that in which the highway ran. The guiding lights of life had all changed their position, but they did not see it. They had no eyes but for their companion, whose flattery acted on them like some powerful drug, until at last the fluttering robe fell off him, and they saw his blackness. It is the old story of the veiled leper who had posed as a great prophet till the veil was withdrawn. Then come the nets, and their souls are bitter with the sense of treachery. Life has grown complicated and unclean. Progress is impossible, for they are entangled with the nets of self-satisfaction that has turned suddenly to shame.

This blunder, however, is neither fatal nor final. God’s shining one is there, to rescue them, though it be with pain and bitterness. This better mood reveals at once as by a flash the true facts of the case. They had not imagined—such was their very lame excuse—that this fine-spoken man had been the Flatterer. As if fine speech were not the



very mark of flatterers ! But this is always the way. Our foolish and wayward hearts refuse to recognize the devil unless he comes wearing the traditional horns and tail—a thing he is far too wise to do.

Then comes the whip, whose lashes are shame and the sense of folly, and conscience, and the discouraging humiliation of a grand mistake. The dreams of sin are sweet, but their sweetness is not worth the bitter misery of the awaking. And in that many-thonged scourge there was one iron-tipped cord that cut deeper than all the rest into their flesh. It was the thought of Ignorance coming on behind. They would see him following with his open mouth agape. They would imagine him rebelling against his accusers as self-sufficient egotists, and having his ignorant mind persuaded and convinced that he was the wise one and they the ignorant fools. They would know that this folly of theirs must destroy any hope of their warnings having good effect upon him. They could not but foresee his doom, for after all their view of him was true, and remained true ; but they would never now be able to think of that impending doom of his without remembering that in some measure they were responsible for his destruction. Truly no man—still more no Christian man—

liveth unto himself. We have no right to our careless follies, even if we are prepared to pay for them in our own humiliation. They are more serious and dangerous matters for others than they are for ourselves.

The chief fault, here as elsewhere, was their not looking at the roll and the map which had been given them. They had their Bible, and they had their own past experience. But they had them both in their pocket, and there neither was of any use whatever. Some of the great words of God (such as Pr 29<sup>5</sup>, which no doubt suggested the whole incident) were despised and neglected. Some of the great lessons of life were forgotten. It is a proverb that 'experience teaches fools'—a proverb to which much objection might be taken, for he is no fool who learns the lessons of experience. These men showed their folly in nothing so plainly as in this, that experience had *not* taught them wisdom. And the end of the whole matter is this, that the only antidotes to flattery are the Bible and one's own past experience. These are the true guides for pilgrims who would walk past the haunted byways of life, and keep a true course on the plain, clean, straight highway that leads to the Celestial City.

## Contributions and Comments.

### Emerods.

I ENCLOSE a reprint of a letter of my brother to the *British Medical Journal*. I am convinced it contains the explanation of the terrible mortality that accompanied the progress of the Ark through Ashdod, Ekron, and Beth-shemesh.

R. H. CHARLES.

Oxford.

[Lieut.-Col. Sir Richard Havelock Charles, K.C.V.O., M.D., whose letter on this subject to the *British Medical Journal* has been sent us by Professor Charles of Oxford, and follows herewith, had a distinguished career at various Universities, both at home and abroad, and passed into the Indian Medical Service in 1881. He was appointed to the Chair of Anatomy and Comparative Anatomy in Lahore Medical College.

He made a special study of the Bubonic Plague in India, carrying on his researches for many years under exceptional advantages.—Editor *E.T.*]

SIR,—In the *Proceedings of the Society of Tropical Medicine*, reported in the Journal of January 2nd, there is a very abbreviated report on an historical incident bearing on the possible spread of plague by the agency of the flea.

The incident is as follows : On the defeat of the Israelites by the Philistines, when the two sons of Eli, Hophni and Phineas, were slain, the Ark of God was taken, carried to Ashdod, and lodged in the temple there. An outbreak of pestilence followed, and, owing to it, the Ark was sent to Gath. There, again, plague occurred, and 'he smote the men of the city, both small and great, and they had emerods in their secret parts.' Whereupon the Gathites forwarded the Ark to Ekron. 'And

it came to pass, as the Ark of God came to Ekron, that the Ekronites cried out, saying, 'They have brought about the Ark of the God of Israel to us, to slay us and our people.' 'There was a deadly destruction throughout all the city.' This plague was evidently of a very acute nature, and not bubonic only, for 'the men that died *not* were smitten with the emerods.'

These three outbreaks, ascribed to the Ark, thoroughly frightened the Philistines, so that they determined to send back to Israel the captured trophy. They arranged to give, as 'a trespass offering,' golden images of the things which struck the observation of the people most as connected with the outbreak. They had noted (a) the emerods (buboes) on the sick, and the presence of a plague of (b) mice (the Hebrew has only one word for *rat* and mouse—*akhbar*) that marred the land. Five golden 'mice' and five golden emerods, placed in a coffer, accompanied the Ark, which was dispatched on a new cart drawn by milch kine. These took the straight line over the frontier to 'the way of Beth-shemesh.' The journey from Ekron to Beth-shemesh was about 12 to 14 miles, and the cart, at the end, was accompanied by the Philistines. There was no human contact. The kine, 'lowing as they went,' arrived in the field of a Bethshemite where the wheat was being cut. The people were rejoiced. They made a burnt-offering of the kine, using the wood of the cart for fuel. The Ark being taken aside, curiosity prompted some to look within it. 'Punishment' followed, and fifty thousand three score and ten men died for this 'offence'!

The points in the story are:

1. Plague was raging at Ashdod.
2. In its temple rats would swarm, as in such buildings at the present day in India, owing to the amount of food of all sorts thrown about.
3. The Ark with its trappings—that is, its three coverings—was interned in the temple.
4. Its coverings were (a) 'a vail of blue and purple and scarlet'; (b) a 'covering of badger skins'; (c) 'a cloth wholly of blue.'
5. The middle covering of badger skins would thus form an ideal place of refuge for the fleas escaping from the rats dead from plague.
6. Outbreaks of pestilence followed on the arrival of the Ark at Gath and Ekron. At both these places human contact entered also.
7. Since no Philistines went with the Ark to the

field of Joshua the Bethshemite, there was no human contact in that instance.

8. Looking into the Ark involved removing the trappings, and hence a disturbance of the fleas in the badger skins.

9. This historical incident I suggest as demonstrating the active part played by the flea in the spread of plague. It is strongly borne out by the valuable work of the India Plague Commission on this subject.

In the Literary Supplement of the *Times*, December 31st, 1908, a reviewer of Butler's 'Characters' quotes—and here is the suggestion of a controversy not extinct yet—'fifty thousand Bethshemites were destroyed for looking into the Ark of the Covenant, and ten times as many have been ruined for looking too curiously into that book in which that story is recorded.'

Sir, I suggest that modern science has afforded an explanation for the singular event mentioned, and has thus cleared, in a natural way, what to many has been a stumbling-block in understanding the severity of this 'punishment.' Many years ago, whilst travelling in the neighbourhood of Beth-shemesh and Ekron it seemed to me a 'hard saying.' In 1896 I brought to the notice of a High Church dignitary the explanation of the mice and emerods. He did not receive it as it was meant! I trust I am not following 'too curiously' this subject, lest some may say 'after whom dost thou pursue? after a dead dog, after a flea.'—I am, etc., R. HAVELOCK CHARLES.

London, W.

### St. John i. 41.<sup>1</sup>

EVERY letter of the Sinaitic Syriac palimpsest is precious, and Mrs. Lewis deserves thanks for her recovery of the evidence that the Greek original of that MS in the above verse read *πρωι*, and not *πρωτον* or *πρωτος*. We may assume with practical certainty that the original autograph of so careful a work as the Fourth Gospel was written in an uncial hand on papyrus. It is also not impossible that the form *πρω*, common enough in Attic, was intended by the author, and very probable that it was so pronounced by him in dictating in any case. If this were so, no final *ι* would appear either after the word or below the line. Now observe that the



word which follows is the article τὸν. In the original the line would read—

ΟΥΤΟCΠΡΩΤΟΝΑΔΕΛΦΟΝ.

No change is easier, whether accidental or intentional, than

ΟΥΤΟCΠΡΩΤΟΝΤΟΝΑΔΕΛΦΟΝ.

This is the first step. The next is the intentional improvement of πρῶτον into πρῶτος. Note also that in the only other passages where πρῶτῳ occurs in this Gospel, it comes, as here, *after* its verb, not before it (18<sup>28</sup> 20<sup>1</sup>)—a strong confirmation of the correctness of the reading. It is not at all impossible for early versions to preserve the correct reading where all Greek MSS have lost it.

A. SOUTER.

### The Last Supper not a Paschal Meal.

IN their interpretation of Lk 22<sup>15, 16</sup>, which was discussed in the December number of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, p. 97 f., and which has such an important bearing on the historical accuracy of St. John, Dr. Burkitt and Mr. Brooke believed themselves to be in a minority of two.<sup>1</sup> It is of interest, therefore, to notice that their view has

<sup>1</sup> It should be noted, however, that, so far back as 1903, this interpretation was advocated by the Rev. G. H. Box in the *Critical Review*, p. 32 ff.; see his note in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, October 1908, p. 106 f.

since gained the weighty support of Professor Harnack in the *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 1909, col. 49 f. The only difficulty the Berlin Professor finds in adopting it is that St. Luke did not himself notice the contradiction between this statement that the Last Supper was not a Paschal Meal, and the general 'Synoptic' view as embodied, for example, in Mk 14<sup>12</sup>. But, as he goes on to point out, even the Marcan account is not wholly consistent, for in Mk 14<sup>2</sup> (cf. also 15<sup>21</sup>) it is distinctly implied that the Crucifixion took place before the Feast had really begun (cf. Wellhausen, *ad loc.*; Dr. Burkitt also draws attention to the inconsistency). And the general result is that the 'Johannine' view of the Last Supper can now be shown to be in accord not only with the Lucan passage as understood above, but also with one of the Marcan sources themselves. Such a threefold cord will hardly be lightly broken.

GEORGE MILLIGAN.

### Postscript to the Forty Wrestlers of Sebaste.

BUT after their spirits from earth had fled,  
Ere the violet woke from its wintry bed,  
There were heralds who shouted a-down the street  
That Cæsar had knelt at the Nazarene's feet;  
For the fadeless glory of Christ's renown  
Outshineth for ever the Roman crown.

### Entre Nous.

#### A Month's Reading.

A short time after the publication of the first volume of the DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE, a professor in one of the Colleges of the United Free Church told the editor that he had begun at the beginning and was reading it right through. And now there is no man in his Church more highly esteemed for scholarship.

If the DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE could be read right through by a man of sufficient determination, the ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS can be read in that way by any one. For the Encyclopædia contains far fewer unimportant articles, and its articles are in many cases of more fundamental as well as of more general interest. Not only so, but

it may fairly be claimed that more attention has been given to their style, and that they are in many cases a contribution to English literature as well as to Religion and Ethics.

Recognizing this, the publishers have begun to issue the Encyclopædia in monthly parts at half a crown, each part being enclosed in an attractive cover. Any bookseller will send the parts regularly along with the monthly magazines.

#### The Review of Theology and Philosophy.

Dr. Menzies is steadily making his Review more necessary. He has always been able to make it interesting. One of the difficulties that have to be overcome is the getting out of the reviews in time.



Sometimes he beats the weeklies and even the dailies. Sometimes he is a little behind.

He is a little behind with the second volume of the *DICTIONARY OF CHRIST AND THE GOSPELS*. But in this case there is no harm done. And the review, which has been written by the Rev. William Edie, B.D., of Dumfries, is a very fine piece of work.

The first article which Mr. Edie mentions is Mr. Barnard's 'Text of the Gospels.' He properly says that Mr. Barnard's work in this department of study is a guarantee of careful treatment. It is now no secret, but it is perhaps not yet generally known, that Mr. Barnard has laid aside these studies and has become an antiquarian bookseller. The work he did in textual criticism has not been surpassed by any one, and he has not yet lost the scholar's hunger of heart. But in the meantime he is throwing his scholarship into the distribution of rare books. His catalogues are the work of a scholar. After opening in Tunbridge Wells, he has so prospered that he has had to transfer the major part of the business to Manchester. But Barnard, Bookseller, Tunbridge Wells, will obtain his catalogues.

We began about Mr. Edie, however. What he says in general about the *D.C.G.* is—'Taken as a whole, these two volumes will prove a most valuable addition to the library of the student and the preacher. To the latter especially they will be full of suggestiveness and help. Having read the volumes, we may be allowed to say that one of the surprises of this Dictionary is its disclosure of numerous fresh and interesting subjects on which to preach. For this as well as other reasons it will doubtless have an effect upon the preaching of this and of many days to come.'

#### The Judgements of the Lord.

To your list of misunderstood texts add Ps 19<sup>9</sup>, 'The judgements of the Lord are true, and righteous altogether.' A correspondent of the *Church of England Pulpit* (March 6, 1909) quotes the verse to prove that we are not to reprehend such acts as the slaughter of the Amalekites. How inadequately do we recognize the necessity of explaining the *English* words of the Bible.

#### Experience.

With the October issue, *Experience* (a quarterly journal for class leaders) entered on a new series.

It is certainly a magazine for the study. If the scholar can neglect it, he cannot despise it (Part-ridge; 3d.).

#### Christian Ethics.

There is an article in the *Guardian* for February 24 on Professor Clark Murray's *Handbook of Christian Ethics*. It is apparently in the form of a review, and it is a review of the book. But the reviewer, whoever he may be, has a conception of what reviewing means which is quite unusual. In seven lines he gives the contents of the book. The rest of the article is occupied with the worth of it, with the contribution which the book makes to our power of appreciating and appropriating the ethics of Christianity.

The book shows, he says, that Christianity stands apart, and that its ethical point of view is its own. But it shows, further, that Christianity has living connexion with the whole movement of human thought; that the Christian supremacy, in fact, lies in its comprehensiveness, in the way in which it takes up into itself all that is excellent and vital in other systems. 'It is a real gain to have this stated clearly, and, we may hope, once for all. For Dr. Murray not only shows that Christianity is comprehensive of other systems, but that Moral Philosophy has had to move towards a solution of the moral question which is in essential harmony with the Christian ideal.'

One of the difficulties, says the reviewer, which confronts the writer of a treatise on Christian Ethics is that Christian morality cannot be divorced from the Christian religion. In the words of Dr. Murray, which he quotes: 'Thus the problem of man's chief end cannot be solved without going beyond himself. It is inextricably bound up with the problem of a cosmic end, an end to which the whole evolution of Nature points. It is therefore by a necessary movement of thought that morality passes over into religion, and it is this movement that Christian ethics represents.'

This is the great practical problem that confronts the preacher of our time. To preach an ethic that is divorced from religion is to descend to that 'mere morality' which secured, and rightly secured, the contempt of our evangelical fathers. To preach a dogmatic that is divorced from conduct is to contradict Christ. 'Two especially interesting chapters in Professor Clark Murray's book,' says this reviewer, 'are those which deal



with the evolution of the Christian ideal, and its relation to the moral ideal of the Hebrews and Greeks, and with the facts of sin, repentance, atonement. When there is so much denial of the reality of sin, so much tendency to blame circumstances for moral failure, it is refreshing to find a writer insisting so vigorously upon the fact of human choice and free personality.'

#### A Song and its Ceremonial.

There is an extraordinary article in *The British Friend* for January about an American Indian hymn. The Friends interpret the precept *Nihil humanum a me alienum* so literally that, of course, they include the American Indians in their interest. An article of this kind should have appeared elsewhere. It would have made us all include them. The author is Mrs. Carta Sturge.

'Any who have had the good fortune to meet with certain Washington publications brought out by the "Bureau of American Ethnology"—rather hard to come by in England—will be well acquainted with the absorbing nature of these apparently technical documents. One scarcely expects, when taking up a dry-looking Report, to find oneself suddenly rapt away into a world of Poetry, or immersed in a mystic realm where one seems to stand in the awesome silence of unseen and eternal energies. Yet such may be the case, and there are some who speak of these documents with bated breath.'

After describing the hymn, Mrs. Sturge says this: 'So wonderful is the effect of these songs, in conjunction with the ceremonials of which they are a part, that words fail, it would seem, in any way to convey it. But it may give some idea of it when I mention the fact (I could not have believed it if I had not cross- and re-cross-examined the witness upon it) that a friend of mine, one of the students of Indian Ceremonial of whom I have spoken, told me that, when attending one particular ceremonial, in which many of these hymns were sung, she sat entranced for twenty-four hours upon a straight-backed chair, without food, without sleep, without lapse of attention, and without once rising from her chair! and that at the end of it she was not tired!

'Can it be that our Friends of the olden time had discovered in some like degree how to realize in absorbed meditation the living presence of God,

when they, as we know they repeatedly did, sat through Meetings three or four hours in length, and the very children seem not to have been tired?'

#### The Great Text Commentary.

The best illustration this month has been found by the Rev. Hugh T. Kerr, Chicago, to whom a copy of Thomson's *The Bible of Nature* has been sent.

Illustrations for the Great Text for May must be received by the 1st of April. The text is Rev 1<sup>10</sup>.

The Great Text for June is Rev 1<sup>17, 18</sup>—'And when I saw him, I fell at his feet as one dead. And he laid his right hand upon me, saying, Fear not; I am the first and the last, and the Living one; and I was dead, and behold, I am alive for evermore, and I have the keys of death and of Hades.' A copy of Fairweather's *The Background of the Gospels* or any recent volume of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES will be given for the best illustration.

The Great Text for July is Rev 2<sup>7</sup>—'To him that overcometh, to him will I give to eat of the tree of life, which is in the Paradise of God.' A copy of Adeney's *Greek and Eastern Churches* or of Rutherford's *Epistles to Colossæ and Laodicea* will be given for the best illustration.

The Great Text for August is Rev 2<sup>10</sup>—'Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee the crown of life.' A copy of Jordan's *Biblical Criticism and Modern Thought* or any volume of the 'Scholar as Preacher' series will be given for the best illustration.

The Great Text for September is Rev 2<sup>17</sup>—'To him that overcometh, to him will I give of the hidden manna, and I will give him a white stone, and upon the stone a new name written, which no one knoweth but he that receiveth it.' A copy of Dr. Robert Scott's *The Pauline Epistles* or of Dr. W. G. Jordan's *Biblical Criticism and Modern Thought* will be given for the best illustration.

Those who send illustrations should at the same time name the books they wish sent them if successful.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, St. Cyrus, Montrose, Scotland.